

THE CLERGY REVIEW

AUGUST, 1951

ARTICLES

| | PAGE |
|--|------|
| (1) The Philosophical Assumptions of Scientists . . . By Reginald J. Dingle | 73 |
| (2) Christianity and the Common Law of England . . . By Richard O'Sullivan | 84 |
| (3) Scared Eloquence—An Examination of Conscience . . . By the Rev. John J. Coyne | 90 |
| (4) Public Speaking By the Rev. A. G. Herring | 96 |
| (5) The Earliest Prints of English Prayers By John Hennig | 99 |

NOTES ON RECENT WORK

| | |
|---|-----|
| Dogmatic Theology By Canon G. D. Smith | 103 |
|---|-----|

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

| | |
|---|-----|
| (1) Manual of Prayers | 117 |
| (2) Attendance at Mass | 119 |
| (3) Legitimacy by Subsequent Marriage | 120 |
| (4) Assistant's Appointment "Audito Parocho" | 122 |
| (5) Vespere Autem Sabbati | 124 |
| (6) Priest Minister of Confirmation—Administrator By Canon E. J. Mahoney | 124 |

ROMAN DOCUMENT

| | |
|------------------------------|-----|
| The Blessed Pius X | 126 |
|------------------------------|-----|

BOOK REVIEWS

| | |
|-----------|-----|
| | 133 |
|-----------|-----|

CORRESPONDENCE

| | |
|---------------------------------------|-----|
| Catholics and B.B.C. Policy | 143 |
| "The Dream of Gerontius" | 144 |

CHURCH AND STATE ABROAD

| | |
|---|---|
| The Case of Archbishop Grösz: I | v |
|---|---|

BURNS OATES & WASHBOURNE LTD.

PUBLISHERS TO THE HOLY SEE

28 ASHLEY PLACE, LONDON, S.W.1

Price Three Shillings Nett

For over a century
BURNS OATES

Founded



1847

the
leading Catholic publishers
have been the means by which some of
the greatest
Catholic Writers
have given their thought to the world.

Today
our book shops provide an unrivalled
book service, personal or by mail.

LONDON

129, Victoria Street, London, S.W.1
(Tel. : VIC 2426)

BIRMINGHAM

1, Edmund Street, Birmingham, 1
(Tel. : MIDland 0226)

MANCHESTER

71-73, Deansgate, Manchester, 3
(Tel. : Blackfriars 9696)

LIVERPOOL

30-32, Manchester Street, Liverpool, 1
(Tel. : Central 1011)

GLASGOW

248, Buchanan Street, Glasgow
(Tel. : Douglas 1574)

DUBLIN

21-22, D'Olier Street, Dublin, C.3
(Tel. : 73115)



The CLERGY REVIEW

NEW SERIES VOL. XXXVI No. 2 AUGUST 1951

THE PHILOSOPHICAL ASSUMPTIONS OF SCIENTISTS

WHATEVER else may be said—and there is quite a lot—about the decision to hold the Festival of Britain this year, it has inevitably provoked discussion on the progress of thought and action between 1851 and 1951. Equally naturally, much of this has been concerned with scientific development which has played so large a part in the history of the last hundred years. Under the editorship of the Professor of the History and Philosophy of Science in University College, London, a volume has been published on *A Century of Science*.¹ Many sermons have been preached, and more no doubt will be, on the “conflict of religion and science” which meant so much in Victorian England. It is certain that a great many of them would have caused some bewilderment to scientists if, against all the probabilities, they had heard them, for there is a general confusion equally evident among scientists and preachers.

On the scientific side this has arisen in this country from an insularity easy to understand. Eight years after the beginning of the century under review, Darwin published his *Origin of Species* and, in an England still Protestant, the controversy turned on a belief that evolution was “against the Bible”. The philosophical objections raised by Catholic writers would not have been understood in the prevailing climate even if they had been noticed. Later, the work of the German Higher Critics was to destroy the scriptural basis of non-Catholic religion in England, and it required the definition of the Assumption of Our Lady to bring about a hasty exhumation of the doctrine that “the Bible and the Bible only is the religion of Christians”. Scripture, abandoned as an argument against Darwin, was still good enough for fighting the Pope.

Of course, not all the misunderstanding has been on one side. If the scientists display their ignorance of theology, count-

¹ Hutchinson, 1951.

less preachers have given the scientists equally good cause to blaspheme. This has been apparent both in what may be called the pessimistic and the optimistic approach to the question. The first is characterized by the delusion that scientific thought has been static. We hear about "the frontiers of science" from those who appear to think that Laplace said the last word for physical science when he dismissed God as an unnecessary hypothesis. Hence the willingness to concede full liberty to the scientist provided he will not unduly extend his territorial ambitions. All his claims may be admitted if he will concede that they have boundaries. The preacher who still attacks the scientist complains that he will not.

There never was a conflict between religion and science because although peace, *pace* Mr Litvinov, is not indivisible, truth is. But there has been a conflict between scientists and theologians and the pessimist, though often less well-informed and intelligent, is right against the optimist in thinking that we have not yet seen the end of it. Nobody who is conversant with contemporary scientific writing can believe that we have had "the last of my territorial demands" and a satisfactory scheme of partition. The optimistic presentation of the case shifts the ground in a fashion which makes the whole controversy bafflingly hard to follow. The mischief of science, we are told, was that it was materialistic. But where is matter now? It has become the transient expression of a transient electrical relation. The scientist asserted matter against mind, but he has recanted. Whatever else may be the scientific fashion today, materialism is not. There are, it is to be feared, many unreflecting Catholics prepared to agree with the late Sir Arthur Eddington that "an idealistic philosophy" is "hospitable towards a spiritual religion".

That the movement of much modern scientific thought, particularly since Einstein, has been in this direction to the extent that the scientist has attempted to philosophize on his own work can hardly be denied. In a recent lecture to the Royal Institution on the Scientific Outlook in 1851 and 1951, it was argued that, whereas the scientist of a hundred years ago conceived it his task to interpret the physical world, the contemporary scientist has no such presumption. There may, or may not, be an

external world, but he is not concerned with it. The idea that he ever was is a delusion. Science is the study of our own experiences and their correlation.

The editor of the symposium already quoted is quite explicit. "Our view of science," he says, "is completely transformed and, although this is far from being generally realized, since the majority of scientists are not philosophically minded and are little more aware than were their great-grandfathers of the pre-suppositions of their work, the whole practice and outlook of modern science is utterly incompatible with the world view of Victorian times." We are offered this conclusion: "If we regard the achievement of science as the discovery of relations between our experiences, we see a continuous and accelerated progress with no observable limitations. . . . If, on the other hand, we try to maintain the old view that what science does is to discover the nature of an independent real world, we must add also that it has discovered that world to be unknowable and self-contradictory and its unveiling unnecessary for the purpose of understanding and predicting our experiences."

We are here presented with pure solipsism. It is ironical to reflect that when the latest speculations of physical science found their way to the newspaper reader it was a common taunt that the scientists had abandoned their proper task of discovering the nature of the physical world and had become metaphysicians. The contemporary solipsist retorts that the truth is quite the opposite. It was the nineteenth-century scientist who was metaphysical. He assumed that underlying the impressions made on his senses there was a mysterious sub-stratum. He may not have talked about substance and accidents, but he believed in them and assumed their existence. The result was an attempted investigation of a supposed external world which led to confusion.

There is, of course, nothing new in this argument that idealism is common sense. Bishop Berkeley claimed that he "agreed with the vulgar". George Henry Lewes, not a very disciplined thinker, agrees. "Men trained in metaphysical speculation," he says, "may find it difficult to conceive the non-existence of an invisible unknowable sub-stratum, but that the bulk of mankind finds it almost impossible to conceive any such sub-stratum is a fact which the slightest inquiry will verify." Is

it necessary to point out that Lewes has fallen into an elementary confusion between conception and imagination? Objects which cannot be imagined—a thousand-sided figure, for example—are quite easily conceived. The difference between what an object is and what it has is so apparent to any mind capable of thought that there is a monstrous paradox in suggesting that it represents some elaborate and unreal creation of the metaphysician.

Byron was nearer to the common judgement of humanity than Lewes when he wrote:

When Bishop Berkeley said "there was no matter,"
And proved it—'Twas no matter what he said.

We should not give an exaggerated importance to this claim that scientists who have assumed that their presuppositions were realist are today and always have been idealists in the philosophical sense. The assertion that it is not the function of the scientist to investigate the "real world" is challenged by, among others, Sir Henry Dale. We have to ask also whether the scientist who advances a solipsist view is talking in terms of method or of ultimate truth. Does he admit the distinction? When we are told that "only that which is observable is significant" we are bound to ask: Significant for what? The crux of Maritain's criticism of Einstein's denial of simultaneity lies in the confusion to which he calls attention between the value of a concept in any particular science and the fact to which the concept relates. Einstein laid himself open to philosophical attack when he went out of his way to assert in a parenthesis that what he said as a physicist he said also as a non-physicist.

If physical science can be shown to be proceeding on idealist assumptions or—in the words of the editor of *A Century of Science*—to be moving "inevitably towards the wider and more actualistic assumptions" in an age increasingly disposed to extend the empire of science, the implications for the future relations between science and religion as Catholics understand it are clear enough.

It should not have been necessary for the Encyclical *Humani Generis* to point out that the pronouncements of the Holy See

on faith and morals, whether they come within the definition of Infallibility or not, are magisterial. Is it fully realized how remarkably the doctrinal encyclicals of recent years fulfil the promise of the work of the Paraclete: "*Quae ventura sunt annuntiabit vobis*"? Only an apprehension of things yet to come can explain the character of the Church's reaction to modernism. It took the form of a recall to the *philosophia perennis*. This was a masterly diagnosis of the root principle of evil in what Pius X called "a compendium of all the errors". The superficial symptoms were entirely misleading.

What presented itself to most intelligent observers in the first decade of this century as the most serious threat to traditional Christian theology? There can hardly be any doubt that it was the system loosely described as Liberal Protestantism. Harnack's *Wesen des Christentums* made an appeal to the religious mind apparently supported by the evidence of historical criticism and congenial to the humanistic temper of the time. It was this system that Loisy and Tyrrell assailed. To the onlooker any errors implicit in their work appeared far less important from the point of view of defenders of ecclesiastical Christianity than their devastating attack on what was then the New Theology. Why should the Church turn so savagely on her own defenders? Why bother about subjectivism and relativism when the words meant so little to anybody?

It is all much clearer today. Relativity as a highly technical theory is the business of the physicist, but it has become more than that. Idealism as the sport of metaphysicians is one thing; as the pre-supposition of scientists in an age of popular culture it is another. We see more clearly why we are ordered back to St Thomas. In 1910, when the Encyclical *Pascendi* appeared, the philosophy of Being meant nothing in our controversies. About ninety per cent of the books published by the Rationalist Press Association implicitly accepted it. If we say today: *Primo in conceptione intellectus cadit ens* we challenge the fundamental assumptions of the most influential school of scientists. We have no excuse for not seeing that the root of the modern malady is a metaphysical error.

There is no need in these columns to repeat the arguments of the philosophical encyclicals, but it may be of interest to

inquire to what extent the recently acquired philosophical consciousness of scientists is leading them in an idealist direction. The tendency is most apparent among the physicists and we have been given a glimpse of the reason. For the purposes of their own synthesis they find it useful to act on contradictory assumptions. If their investigations deal with an external world, it is discovered to be "unknowable and self-contradictory". May we suggest that it is a little hasty to pass final judgement on these grounds?

We have not yet emerged from the period of controversy on the question: "What is science?" The claims of this or that body of studies to be called "scientific" are warmly asserted and denied and a plea has been made for the development of self-criticism among scientists, which has been described as the missing factor in contemporary science. This makes it relevant to recall the traditional attitude of the Church towards the special sciences and their relation to philosophy. The view of de Bonald, Lamennais, and others that human reason must seek its first principles and grounds of certitude in revealed religion is sometimes quoted as though it represented the position of the Church until she retreated before the advance of modern science. It was, as a matter of fact, publicly condemned by Pope Gregory XVI who died a dozen years before the publication of the *Origin of Species*. Scientists have no war to wage with the Church for the autonomy of their various disciplines.

It is equally the mind of the Church that the conclusions of the scientist are subordinate to the judgement of the philosopher and the philosopher's to those of revelation. To require the scientist to seek his evidence outside his own field of study would be to challenge the amazingly fruitful work of scientific investigators in so many fields, but the doctrine of subordination already quoted is a necessary deduction from the fact that truth cannot conflict with truth. The alternative is a disorderly world and the drastic remedy of the solipsist physicist is to remove the world!

With the enlarged area of the special sciences, there is a tendency to sub-divide them. A century ago there were "men of science" pursuing different sorts of studies with common assumptions. Today we hear from Professor Collingwood of "the

practical sciences" and "the theoretical sciences". Dr F. M. R. Walshe in his stimulating Linacre Lecture last year on *Humanism, History, and Natural Science in Medicine*¹ distinguished between the methods of natural science and those of historical science. These distinctions become important when we recognize that assumptions in one branch may be held not to be necessary in another, for the tendency of all specialized workers is to assume that the conditions of their particular discipline are those of human thought generally.

We are here brought to the intellectual foundations of Christianity. For the modernist to whom dogma is essentially related to subjective experience, the problem does not arise. For the Catholic to whom it is the expression of Truth—the *adaequatio rei et intellectus*—it is of the utmost importance whether the fundamental laws on which the intellectual demonstration of the faith rests have an absolute value or a relative one. Are they principles of reality as well as of the mind? Are they the tools of one special science but useless in another? If so, is that the last word about them?

It is on the place of history and psychology that speculation and controversy largely turn. Literary criticism may be added to the list. Talk about "historical science" did not escape early protests that Clio is a muse. The late Professor Sir Arthur Quiller-Couch was unrelenting in his attacks on those who applied to literature the methods proper to science. Today the dispute is generally settled not by any effective reply to these criticisms but by extending the conception of science. Whether this makes for clarity or confusion the reader must decide for himself, but the plain man may be inclined to hold that there is a distinction of importance between the necessary truths of mathematics and physics and the contingent facts of history, which are so but might have been otherwise. The regicides in Britain and France in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries are not data of the same kind as the boiling of water in given conditions at a stated temperature. It is only by an equivocation that we can call both studies scientific.

From the idealist standpoint already quoted they qualify for admission to the same category by being subjects of ex-

¹ Livingstone, 1950.

perience. The conclusions are far-reaching but they are boldly accepted. Herschel is criticized for having quoted with approval in his Presidential Address to the British Association in 1845 the remark of an earlier President that "a man may as well keep a register of his dreams . . . if the spirit of grouping, combining, and eliciting results be absent". Whatever qualifications may have to be made about the passage from which this extract is taken, we are disposed to argue that it contains more truth than falsehood. The student of a man's character may find significance in that part of his psychic life which occurs during sleep. The study of dreams may therefore be a useful occupation of the psychologist. Does that mean that a "register of dreams" will yield scientific results in the same sense as a study of mammals or mushrooms? Those who believe that Freud or one of his rivals has produced a "science of dreams" may hold so although the fact that they have to choose between irreconcilable accounts of it is sufficient to show how far we are from the climate of the established sciences. More evidence than we have yet had will be needed to show that Freud's results have any more claim to be considered scientific than the contents of *Napoleon's Book of Dreams* that entertained the Victorian housemaid.

Is medical psychology to be considered a science? It is largely a question of terminology. Dr Walshe is prepared to accept the fashionable classification and give it a place in "historical science" while denying it right of city in "natural science". It may be remarked in passing that we find this practice of extended definitions exemplified, as might be expected, in an extravagant form in politics. If the politician were not compelled to appeal to Everyman for "the favour of your vote and interest" we might conceivably have an intelligent discussion on "the Welfare State" with a definition of the term as a starting point. Practical considerations make it necessary to conduct every argument round the question: "How can we preserve the Welfare State?"

It is not obvious why we need to discuss the conception of science in the same way, but let us accept the fact that it is agreed to do so. This makes things easier for those theoretical physicists who are led by the dilemmas of their own discipline

to propound an idealist philosophy, and there is no occasion for surprise when we find medical psychology occupying what Sir Henry Dale can hardly be alone in considering a disproportionate place in a review influenced by idealist presuppositions.

There is an extension of the mischief when Psychology and Medical Psychology are confused. In any contemporary approach, the Catholic grounded in the teachings of the Schools will expect to find *der Sprung über das Mittelalter* and he will not be disappointed. The contribution of Sir Cyril Burt to *A Century of Science* is concerned with general psychology and we are told that "from the time of Aristotle down to the middle of the nineteenth century it remained, as it had begun, a branch of philosophy rather than of natural science". Is it necessary to point out that to the Thomist, psychology is a branch of biology and its method experimental? The "faculty psychology" of St Thomas is based on experience. To Sir Cyril Burt the work of Herbert Spencer is "a new conception". In point of fact, the nineteenth century was awakening from its Cartesian dream and returning to the thirteenth.

What is the relevance of all this to religion? The late Professor Collingwood has indicated it as clearly as anyone. For him there are "theoretical sciences" and "practical sciences". In some the conception of causality plays a part, in others it does not. Let us turn to the Encyclical *Humani Generis*. According to this (I quote the translation of Mgr Knox), the philosophy of the Church "upholds the real genuine validity of human thought-processes; it upholds unassailable principles of metaphysics—sufficient reason, causality and finality; it upholds the possibility of arriving at certain and unalterable truths".

Here is the real problem of the relations between science and religion. If the special scientist is content to say that for the purposes of his particular investigations he is able to proceed without regard to causality, we have no necessary quarrel with him. If advancing "through Science to Philosophy" he wishes to argue that causality has only a methodological significance, the issue is joined.

Collingwood argued on these lines. Medicine, he contended, proceeded on causal assumptions, but some branches of physics did not. Not unnaturally he was led to overstate the case in his

anxiety to show the ancillary character of metaphysical principles in scientific work. "Suppose," he writes,¹ "someone claimed to have discovered the cause of cancer, but added that his discovery would be of no practical use because the cause he had discovered was not a thing that could be produced or prevented at will. Such a person would be ridiculed by his colleagues in the medical profession."

There is no need to suppose, for Cohnheim's theory seems to come within this definition. We are in no position to say what is the present status of Cohnheim's views. They may be rejected and certainly investigators have wisely proceeded on the assumption that they were false since they led nowhere. But they were not "ridiculed". Whatever the doctor may do as a practical man he does not perform a surgical operation on his intelligence. As a technician he may limit himself, but as a man he cannot deny the imperative metaphysical need.

*Cognoscetis veritatem et veritas liberabit vos.*² Truth here is not the tool of a trade. It is an absolute. It is the natural object of the mind as vision is of the eye and hearing of the ear. When we have grasped this we recognize that, however hospitable an idealistic philosophy may be to "a spiritual religion", it is lethal to the Faith. When we have made the correlation of our mental states the object of science we have emancipated the Catholic from the contemptuous glance of the scientist but he shares this freedom with Mr Sludge's client consoled by "the shade of the venerable dead one". An experience is an experience existing in its own right. All cats are grey in the dark.

When the Vatican Council declared that the existence of God could be proved by natural reason, it reaffirmed the words of St Paul:³ *Invisibilia enim ipsius a creatura mundi, per ea quae facta sunt intellecta conspiciuntur*. This is meaningless language unless the principles of metaphysics are, as the latest Encyclical affirms, unassailable. Hypotheses useful in one set of sciences and irrelevant in another will need some higher claim if they are to establish anything of universal validity. If the human mind be not *capax entis* our faith is vain.

Even where contemporary scientific thinking does not com-

¹ *An Essay on Metaphysics* (Oxford, 1941).

² Rom. i, 20.

³ John viii, 32.

plete the journey to solipsism it calls for careful study. Inevitably the great advances in organic neurology with the light they have thrown on the nature of nerve-impulses and their relation to perception have affected the theory of knowledge. In the recent lecture to the British Postgraduate Medical Federation¹ the President of the Royal College of Physicians, Dr Russell Brain, surveys the field from a standpoint which might be described as realist rather than idealist but he ends with an interesting reference to "a nervous system evolved to facilitate action upon the physical world". It would be bold, he thinks, to claim that this system "is capable of presenting the mind with conceptual symbols adequate for the whole of reality". It would indeed, but many questions suggest themselves. What do we mean by speaking of a system being "evolved to facilitate" this or the other? Are we offered a teleological explanation or must the language be interpreted in terms of Vaihinger's *Als ob*?

No extension or refinement of information about the methods by which knowledge of the external world is received through the physical apparatus can affect the *intellectus agens* and its fundamental laws. What the papal encyclicals make clear with increasing emphasis is that the climate of modern thinking becomes more dangerous to the Faith when it appears to be more congenial. We have selected the physicists as an example, but the case is perhaps clearer in that playground between science and superstition in which Carl Gustav Jung of Zurich and his disciples disport themselves, *ut in errorem inducantur (si fieri potest) etiam electi*.

REGINALD J. DINGLE

¹ *Lancet*, 21 April, 1951.

CHRISTIANITY AND THE COMMON
LAW OF ENGLAND¹

THE Old Hall of Lincoln's Inn, from which by the courtesy of the Treasurer and the Masters of the Bench, we are now speaking to you, is the oldest of all the buildings of the Inns of Court and Chancery.

It is a noble Hall, with its fine timber roof and its linen-fold panelling, built in the very year that Columbus discovered America, and rebuilt and restored brick by brick, between the two world wars. It is now almost exactly as it was in the early Tudor time.

As I look round I see on the windows and the walls the figures of St Richard of Chichester and Sir John Fortescue, St Thomas More and Sir Matthew Hale. These names remind us that we owe the balance of the constitution and the principles of the Common Law to the labours of prelates of the Church and of judges and lawyers of the Inns of Court.

The Common Law of England is in fact the only great system of temporal law that came out of the Christian centuries. It has a history of nearly a thousand years. Today its principles and traditions rule the life of England and Ireland; of Australia and New Zealand; of the African and West Indian colonies; of Canada (except Quebec); and of all the States save one of the American Union.

Some of the leading principles of the Common Law have been extended by Statute to India, and to Pakistan. From all the lands that I have named, students come to London to study the traditions and principles of the Common Law in this old Hall and in the Halls of the other Inns of Court.

The law of the rest of the civilized world, of Holland and Belgium and France, and Italy and Spain, and their dependencies, and of the Republics of South America, is governed by the very different principles and traditions of the Roman Civil Law, a legal system of great technical perfection. The Roman Law has a history of twenty-five centuries, and was in

¹ An address broadcast 3 June, 1951, and reproduced by courtesy of the B.B.C.

origin and essence a pagan system of law. It obliged men to pay divine honours to the Emperor—the Roman Caesar—as the story of so many Christian martyrs shows. He had absolute power; nothing was beyond him. The pleasure of the Prince had the force of law. And observe that the totalitarian tendency in the Roman law lingered for centuries in countries like Russia and Germany where the rulers significantly retained the title of Caesar in the form of Kaiser and of Czar. It was a French King too, Louis Quatorze, who identified the State with his own person, in his famous declaration: "*L'Etat c'est moi.*"

Apart from its exaltation of the Emperor, the Roman system also gave an exaggerated status to the father of the family—the *paterfamilias*—who at one time had power of life and death over his children. The *paterfamilias* could control his son at any age; could forbid his marriage at any age, could force a marriage on him; could compel him to divorce his wife. In matters of property too, the father claimed and held everything.

Another leading feature of the Roman system was the institution of slavery. The slave was a human being without rights; in law not a person but a living instrument or thing.

With the coming of Christianity, a new spirit entered the world. We find St Paul writing to the master of a runaway slave: "I am sending him back to thee: make him welcome, for my heart goes with him. . . . Do not think of him any longer as a slave; he is something more than a slave, a well-loved brother, to me in a special way; much more to thee, then, now that both nature and Christ make him thy own."

The same spirit is reflected in the Acts of the Apostles, where Peter and John, being commanded not to speak or teach in the name of Jesus, made answer: "Whether it be right in the sight of God to hearken unto you more than unto God, judge ye." Right in the sight of God, a new foundation for jurisprudence was now being laid.

When the Emperor Justinian promulgated the Roman Civil Law, he claimed to legislate for the Church as well as for the State; and he even perpetuated certain principles that were scarcely Christian, like the institutions of slavery and divorce.

It was, you may imagine, these pagan elements in the Roman law that impelled the English lawyers of the twelfth

century, who had to frame a system of law for all England, to turn their eyes away from the Roman texts and to hammer out, in the fire of justice, the new system of the common law. "It was," we are told, "the critical moment in English legal history and therefore in the innermost history of our land and of our race. It was the moment when old custom was brought into contact with new science. . . . Much in our national life and character depended on the result of that contact. It was a perilous moment. . . . But of this there can be no doubt, that it was for the good of the whole world that one race stood apart from its neighbours, turned away its eyes at an early time from the fascinating pages of the *Corpus Juris* and made the grand experiment of a new (legal) system."

The prelates and the lawyers who were fashioning the Common Law of England argued that it was not absurd to call by the name of law the unwritten rules and customs of the realm. These men, the judges and Serjeants of the King's Bench and the Common Pleas, gave to the Common Law its first principles and its creative energy. "As the King's Court organized itself, we are told, slowly but surely justice done in the King's name becomes the most important kind of justice, reaches out into the remotest corners of the land, grasps the small affairs of small folk, as well as the great affairs of earls and barons. Above all local customs rose the custom of the King's Court": the Common Law of England.

The Common Law started with a noble conception of man, and a noble conception of law, of man as a reasonable being and of law as a reasonable rule. It was designed from the beginning to create and to establish a society of free men and women living in the fellowship of a free community. The first text book of the Common Law introduces a concept of the ordinary man of the law: "the free and lawful man". "By virtue of his nature man is free." Henry of Bracton, Chancellor of Exeter Cathedral, and father of the Common Law, at once condemned slavery as a thing contrary to natural right and justice. The constant effort of the Common Law was to raise Everyman to the status of freedom: to a life of independence and individual responsibility.

Every man and woman is in the Christian view a reasonable

and responsible person. In 1215—it was the year of Magna Carta—the Lateran Council published a great decree: *Omnis utriusque sexus fidelis*: Every Christian of either sex who has reached the age of discretion is bidden to confess his sins at least once a year and to receive Holy Communion during the Easter time.

Within the family the spread of the Christian spirit undermined the power of the *paterfamilias*. The family to be sure remained the natural unit of society. Within it there was a complete readjustment on Christian principles of the relations between husband and wife, and parent and child. Marriage, being now a sacrament, formed an indissoluble union between the spouses, and gave to children and parents an abiding sense of social security. The natural right and duty of parents to maintain and educate their children was fully recognized. The principle has been vindicated by the latest researches in psychology which reveal that the broken home is the chief source of juvenile delinquency; and that the best guarantee of a happy adult is a childhood spent in the visible love and protection of both parents.

The sanctity of the family underlies and explains another leading principle of the Common Law: that "the house of Everyman is to him as his castle and fortress, as well for his defence against injury as for his repose". The protection which the law gave to the King's Peace was matched by the protection it gave to the peace of every household.

In the life of the community, Henry of Bracton sounded a principle that went echoing through the centuries and all round the world. "The King is under God and the law." There are higher rules of justice and of right that the King must recognize; the law of God, the law of nature, the law of the land. Bracton frames this central rule of the constitution on the example of our Lord, and of our Lady. The King ought to be under the law, he says, even as our Lord willed to be under the law in His mission to redeem mankind. And our Lady also, for all her singular privilege, was content, as an example of humility, to conform to the decrees of Caesar and the customs of the Jewish community. *Sic ergo Rex*, says Bracton; so too the King, lest his power should be unbridled. The King of England was never

able to change the laws without the assent of his subjects, nor to burden an unwilling people with strange taxes.

The Christian sense of the autonomy of the moral and spiritual life, was secured by the organization of Church and State as distinct and equal powers. The first clause of Magna Carta guaranteed the freedom of the Church in its proper sphere: "The Church in England shall be free and shall have all its laws in their integrity and its liberties unimpaired."

The spirit of Magna Carta is revealed in the Preamble which tells us that the Charter was made and granted "for the honour of God, the exaltation of Holy Church, the welfare of the realm, and the good of the King's soul". The author of Magna Carta was Stephen Langton, who is called by Professor Powicke "a real English prelate, troublesome alike to King and Pope". Here within the memory of Whit Sunday, we may recall that Stephen Langton, who taught theology for twenty years at the University of Paris, was the author while there of perhaps the greatest of the Christian hymns, the *Veni Sancte Spiritus*.

The Christian sense of human dignity and human freedom animates Magna Carta and explains the constitutional balance between Church and State which put the moral and spiritual life of man beyond the power and reach of the political officers of the community. In England, where the Church is a more venerable institution than the State, the ordinary man of the law has always been at once a citizen and a Christian. The law's typical man, the typical person is "the lay Englishman, free but not noble, who is of full age and who has forfeited none of his rights by crime or sin". The reference to "crime or sin" introduces us at once to Church and State, and to the balance between these powers that is proper to a free community.

It is the sense of human freedom and of human dignity in the Common Law that gave us (right from the beginning) the rule that Everyman shall be deemed to be a good man innocent of crime and wrongdoing, until the contrary is proved by lawful evidence. Of course the contrary is proved in many instances. It is, as Fortescue explains, the effect of original sin in us. Those who seek to follow right and virtue need the help of divine grace. The exclamation of an English priest on seeing some

criminals taken to execution: "But for the grace of God, there goes John Bradford" finds an echo in many minds at the Bar and on the Bench.

The achievement of the Common Law was thus to raise slave and serf and villein to the status of freedom. In social life the ordinary man of the law was the yeoman or the artisan: free, responsible, independent, God-fearing.

"The past," says Professor Tawney, "has shown us no more excellent social order than that in which the mass of the people were the masters of the holdings which they ploughed and of the tools with which they worked, and could boast with the English freeholder that 'it is a quietness to a man's mind to live upon his own and to know his heirs certain'."

In the simple folk that fill the background of Shakespeare's plays, we catch a reflection of the ordinary man of the Tudor and the early Stuart times. Listen to Corin the shepherd answering Touchstone:

"Sir, I am a true labourer; I earn that I eat, get that I wear; owe no man hate, envy no man's happiness; glad of other men's good, content with my harm; and the greatest of my pride is to see my ewes graze and my lambs suck."

Such characters in Shakespeare, and morality plays like *Everyman*, and the great poem of *Piers Plowman*, show that the elements and the ideas of the mediaeval Christian tradition, had made their way into the lives of the common folk, and there found a vital unity that the more highly cultivated classes failed to achieve. If, says Mr Christopher Dawson, the barbarians of the west learned to think such thoughts and to speak such a language, it shows that a new Christian culture had been born, which was not an alien ideal imposed externally but had come to be the common inheritance of ordinary men.

The Common Law of England was one of the instruments of that culture, and is part of that inheritance. The achievement of the Christian lawyers was to establish free men and women in the fellowship of a free community. They were the architects of freedom.

Today an attempt is being made throughout the world to

deny their ideal and to destroy their achievement. Happily in all the countries of the Common Law tradition this attempt is meeting and will meet with determined resistance. In the end the tradition of a thousand years, of two thousand years, will surely prevail. And the secret heart of the tradition will resume its beat, throbbing with the movement of a common human culture, and a common Christian faith.

RICHARD O'SULLIVAN

SCARED ELOQUENCE

AN EXAMINATION OF CONSCIENCE

SOME few years ago one of our seminary magazines referred (in an inspired misprint) to a distinguished former member of the college staff as the "professor of scared eloquence". The news editors were not slow to seize upon the phrase to the disadvantage of their local preachers. And then the matter was forgotten.

But if we priests examine our conscience about it we might admit that there is more to it than an unhappy misprint. True, the age of oratory and eloquence has departed. Possibly only on the stage do we find the echoes of an earlier generation which thought speaking to be worth while, and took the trouble to make it so. Modern inventions with their new technique have abolished the speech in favour of the fireside chat. Even a Disraeli or Gladstone heard over the radio might compare ill with their modern successors whose oratory is not particularly distinguished. The leader of His Majesty's Opposition is almost alone today in maintaining a standard of public speaking that was once taken for granted in men of his position. Too easily are we inclined to regard him as sole survivor of a species that passed away with the hansom and the brougham.

But the sermon is not the speech. Nor is it always, or even usually, the radio fireside talk. Even if in the Mother of Parlia-

ments in these degenerate days honourable members mouth their notes and mumble them to their feet, there is no reason why preachers of the word of God should do likewise. We have something divinely well worth saying. We ought to say it as well as is humanly possible.

Naturally it requires much more than voice production to make the successful sermon. Prayer is the first necessity. We take that for granted. But do we take it too much for granted? Then there is our other preparation. Remotely (but not too much so) it is our reading of the Sacred Scripture and our general spiritual reading. Dare we suggest that the reading of the *Et reliqua* at Matins is hardly an adequate reading of the Scriptures? Nor will a hurried perusal of one or two articles in a spiritual monthly store our minds sufficiently for us to be able to give of our plenty.

Proximate preparation (how useful is the consecrated terminology of the authors!) will differ for different people. It will even differ for the same person in different circumstances. The special occasion will demand extra effort. But that does not mean that the ordinary occasion demands no effort at all. We ought to begin at the bottom and work upwards to an ever-increasing standard of excellence, not start at the top and descend somewhere below mediocrity.

Again, since parish differs from parish, we must take that also into account. The discourse suitable to one congregation might roll like so many noisy and unintelligible thunders over the heads of another. The instruction attuned to the needs of the simple might scarce be relished by their neighbours in a different walk of life.

And then, most proximately, how do we approach the pulpit? Is our sermon or instruction all written out? Is it committed to memory? Or do we carry saving notes up our sleeve in case of sudden disaster? Possibly, lacking photographic memories, we distrust the written word, and have headings stored up for elucidation. And it may happen that we are that most dangerous of all preachers, the man with ready facility, who is always prepared to mount the pulpit but rarely anxious to come down.

At the other extreme we may be scared to such an extent

that our lips and tongue refuse to do the bidding of our will. We are always on the point of making an exhibition of ourselves. Our listeners suffer with us. We develop a pulpit complex. We begin to wish that priests had only to offer sacrifice and not spread the kingdom also by the ministry of the spoken word.

All this seems to suggest that a priest only begins to practise his preaching when he is sent on his first priestly assignment. That we know to be untrue. But experience proves that not a few preachers give the impression that they are practising at the expense of their hearers. Sadly enough, experience also teaches us that in any other walk of life where public speaking is essential, some of us would find no place. We cannot speak. We do not seem to know how to set about our own particular job.

As this is but an examination of conscience and not a retreat conference, we shall prescind from the many urgent spiritual reasons which ought to prompt us to seek perfection in this matter. Here let it suffice to take note of some of the very ordinary natural reasons which ought to encourage us and, if necessary, embarrass us.

The first thing that occurs to mind is that we live by the Gospel. And this surely does not exclude the fact that we preach the Gospel. A certain spiritual *noblesse oblige*, then, should encourage us to make certain that our listeners at least hear the Gospel which we preach. Let us be blunt about it. We owe it to our people that they should be able to hear us. And this not only because they are obliged to sit and listen to what we say, but because for that very reason (among others) they are contributing to our support.

Again, if a man does not appear to be wholeheartedly interested in his subject, he can hardly expect to interest others. Is it not a too common experience that the Sunday night sermon is a mumbled and not altogether logical *précis* of what somebody else has already preached and had the courage to publish? If we think our message worth while, we should take the trouble to let others appreciate the fact. The critic may answer that we have the Mass as the centre of our liturgy and hence need not apply ourselves so closely to the ministry of the

word. But that in itself is but a cogent reason why we should be able to speak eloquently about the Mass and the liturgy.

Another objection that one sometimes hears is that preachers are born, not made. Admittedly some men have a greater share of natural gifts in this direction than others. But no good speaker or preacher becomes such without effort. Every man who puts his mind to it can become at least passable.

We may well ask ourselves whether we are too proud to admit our defects. Are we willing to take the steps necessary to improve our preaching? Do we not rather despise those few intrepid men who undertake a course in voice production and voice training with a view to improving their pulpit utterance? Or do we lazily tell ourselves that after all as secular priests we can safely leave it to the preaching Orders and Congregations to supply for our own acknowledged defects?

Priests are sometimes surprised to be congratulated by their congregations because they can be heard in all parts of the church. This praise of the one individual is in itself a condemnation of so many others who cannot be heard. Making all allowances for the very many difficulties which undoubtedly do exist, we can only say as a result of self-examination, that the general standard of pulpit speaking is not far from being deplorable.

Self-examination without a firm purpose of amendment is of little use. It can be discouraging and depressing. If we feel that we are in any way culpable, we know the remedy. In their affection for our other good works, the laity may not tell us that we fail in this respect. But any priest whose duty has taken him around the country can testify that there is widespread and general discontent among the faithful laity about the standard of clerical preaching. Surely, as the victims, they have the right to protest. We as the (possibly unwitting) causes of their discontent are surely also humble enough to take note and apply the remedy.

If we doubt the accuracy of this picture, let us make the experiment of trying to name off-hand a dozen famous preachers. It is more difficult than it sounds. A northern prelate staying in London over the week-end asked his hosts which of the more outstanding preachers would be speaking on the Sunday. They

were hard put to name them. And yet old files of the *Tablet* carry on almost every page the names of men who commanded attention because of their eloquence and the message it conveyed. We have the same message. Have we the eloquence?

An obstacle with which preachers of former time had not to contend is the loud-speaker. Of its use for outdoor functions there can be no doubt. But it is a mixed blessing within. Few of those installed are perfect. In a large Glasgow church there is a perfect installation. But all through the sermon or function there is someone at the controls. Elsewhere the preacher himself is responsible for the speaker's functioning and he usually finds it a distraction. We can marvel at those giants of old who were able to make themselves heard throughout the vastness of Westminster Cathedral. But we should not too readily conclude that every parish church is a cathedral and promptly install loud-speaker equipment.

It is a fallacy that such equipment solves the problem of the poor speaker. Often good speakers are spoiled and poor speakers lulled into a sense of completely false security by the knowledge that the microphone is "on".

All that we have said seems to take for granted that we are only beginning to tackle the problem as priests already at work in our parishes. It would be little less than dishonest not to ask ourselves about our training before ordination.

We all know how profitless is that clerical parlour game in which the man on the mission tells the seminary professor that his theory may be very well but that it never works in practice. And the professor is supposed to retort that the man on the mission is a philistine whose practice is probably all wrong in any case. But does this preclude our asking just how far our seminary training takes us? May we never make suggestions? Dare we offer of our own experience in a world where the theory has to be translated into practice if it is going to be of use in our priestly work?

Of all tasks that of the Professor of Sacred Eloquence is surely the most unenviable. Other professors are judged either by their ponderous tomes or their clarity of explanation or their prowess in dictating notes. The unfortunate professor of Sacred Eloquence

must be able to display in his own speaking and preaching all those many excellences he demands of his students. These latter may be full of good-will, ready to imitate to the letter all that they are taught. But the human element in them makes them merciless critics of all the flaws they imagine they detect in their teacher.

Often enough the professor has no contact with his students until he meets them as young men in first year theology. They are at an age when it is extremely difficult to change provincialisms in accent and expression. They may (in spite of past education—or possibly because of it) have little vocabulary. Modern certificate examinations are not conducive to the writing of good English. Now whilst the good writer may never become a preacher owing to other defects, the good preacher needs to be able to compose if he is going to express himself in the spoken word. All or much of this is outside the professor's control. Still, presuming that he himself is a good speaker with a knowledge of the theory and an ability to demonstrate it in practice, what chance has he of training his students to be likewise good speakers? It is not impertinent to ask this question. Many bishops in the last few years have complained about the inadequacy of their young priests in the pulpit.

Is it not true that Sacred Eloquence, like Church History in the not too far distant past, is somewhat of a Cinderella? Naturally students are told what will happen if they fail to make the grade. Admission to Orders is at times deferred. Is that enough? It all seems very negative. The writer and most of his contemporaries had preached about half a dozen practice sermons in the four years before ordination to the priesthood. The large numbers in the seminary theology section made it impossible to do more since sermons were relegated to Sunday like the famous Eton Sunday Qs. And like these they induced as much or as little interest. Can any priest really recall student sermons that were worth while? But if the deacon before Trinity was dull and possibly profitless, the priest after Trinity could not expect to be better. There was much criticism. But student criticism tends to be stereotyped—especially when the critic himself must also endure the future criticism of his present victim. The professor summed up at the end. And then one sighed with relief. Ser-

mons were over as far as oneself was concerned for a term or even a year.

It is as true of this department of sacred studies as of any other that our training does not end when we are ordained. But it is probably more difficult to persuade men that it is true in this case than in any other. And if (apart from voluntary activities such as debating societies) the only official training received before ordination is the weekly ordeal of the few before the many, then can we expect young priests to be convinced of the need for further training?

What is the solution? Ideally the scaffolding of voice production, voice training and standard accent should be finished with long before the young man's eloquence becomes divine or sacred. Sacred Eloquence should have something on which to build. More opportunity should be found for practice. A newly ordained priest should possess not only a number of sermons to preach, but he should know from intensive training how to preach them. That will give him confidence when he faces his first congregation. It will encourage him never to fall below his initial standard. The fact that his contemporaries also are equally prepared will improve the general standard of pulpit speaking. Newer generations of priests will have something to live up to. And if in future years men cannot readily recall the names of the famous preachers, it will be because the ordinary standard is so high that it will be well-nigh impossible to outstrip it.

JOHN J. COYNE

PUBLIC SPEAKING

MUCH has been written about the structure of the speech or sermon. Not so much perhaps of its relation to the audience—and it may be that this is where psychology can render a little help. So our purpose here and now is to consider preaching not from a religious or spiritual point of view—but purely from that of psychology.

To begin with a preacher is a leader—at least for the time being. And “the most important quality in a leader is that of

being acknowledged as such" (André Maurois). This agrees with Emerson who says that eloquence should mean, above all, "a taking sovereign possession of the audience". And Quiller-Couch ("Q") remarks that one of the differences between reading a book and listening to a speaker is that one may well approach the latter in a "certain state of excitement". In all this the Catholic preacher is well placed, having the certainty of his doctrine and the authority of his official position.

Closely connected with all this is the power and effect of the human voice. It is worth remembering that the human voice is perhaps the first sound which, as babies, we hear or appreciate, and so the spoken words of today may possibly arouse associations anywhere along a line which goes right back to our earliest moments. Here we come upon one of the ways in which a speech is much more effective than the written word. Hitler remarks that a man simply refuses to read what he thinks will be opposed to his tastes or belief; "not infrequently it is a case of overcoming ingrained prejudices—mostly unconscious and supported by sentiment rather than reason. Nothing but an appeal to these hidden forces will be effective here—only the orator can hope to make it".¹

This is no doubt an exaggerated statement but there is much truth in it. The spoken word certainly has at times the power of calling up associations, releasing forces and inflaming emotions in a way seldom effected by the written word—excluding the inspired words of Holy Scripture.

"Q" speaks of "a penetrating power of persuasion in the human voice . . . an intimacy even with large audiences". Moreover this association and recall may not be due merely to the content of the spoken words but far more to the tone and emotional appeal—When was I made to feel like that before? How much the voice reveals—sex, age, health and something as to character. Paderewski remarks of a famous man that when he met him he was disappointed because he was disappointed in his voice which, he felt, should indicate greatness, even if we know not how. Perhaps some words about singing may be true of speaking . . . "behind all words in singing there is the living breath which is to the voice as is the bow to the violin".² In

¹ *Mein Kampf* (English tr.), p. 392.

² *Chambers' Encyd.*, art. "Singing".

the Bible how close is the connexion between life and breath.

We often speak of gregariousness or group activity but it is difficult to say what lies at the root of these experiences. May it not be that speaking and hearing together constitute a fundamental element therein? Even if speech is the only link (without nearness or sight) it has a welding power. "The listener feels himself linked to the voice which seems to be speaking across the ether for him alone and yet . . . he feels himself just one of a vast chain of listeners all taking part in the same rite."¹

But the relation of Speaker or Leader should not be a one-way activity. The audience have their influence which may be a great help. One speaker said he used to begin to prepare his next discourse very soon after delivering one because he then still had with him the feel of the attitude and temper of his audience as a moulding influence. A speaker can watch his hearers to see if they seem to follow and understand. He may make little essays of one kind or another and if one seems to be appreciated he can perhaps develop it on the spot. Theatrical people have sometimes built up quite a useful bit of "business" starting from something small and by-the-way. As Emerson says, "I believe that some orators go to the assembly as to a closet where to find their best thoughts." It has been said of some secular oratory that what is received as a vapour is given back as a flood.

The dogmatic and authoritative character of preaching makes it impossible to accept this statement as it stands—but Bishop Dupanloup² said . . . "Keeping touch with the audience, means seeking one's own words in the souls that are listening to us."

Rather in line with this is a statement of Newman: "Definition is the life of preaching. A definite hearer, not the whole world; a definite topic, not the whole evangelical tradition, and, in like manner a definite speaker."³

Everything is brought to a focus. There is a now-ness about preaching which people like and which is absent from written books. "Nothing which is of yesterday will preach" (Newman). There is Contact—living Contact. Here we come back to the

¹ A. M. Meerloo. *Total War and the Human Mind*, p. 40.

² Preface to *The Ministry of Preaching*.

³ *Idea of a University*, p. 425.

idea of the essence of gregariousness or communal experience. The gospel is news—and seems all the more fresh and telling when proclaimed.

A. G. HERRING

THE EARLIEST PRINTS OF ENGLISH PRAYERS

THE historical connection between the spreading of intellectual culture among the middle class and the invention of book-printing could be described as the foundation of modern civilization. In fifteenth-century Northern Europe both reading and book-production were still primarily concerned with religious subjects. The reading of prayers by the laity in church services and in private devotions was an important feature in the growth of religious self-consciousness among the common people. Prayer-books therefore occupy a prominent position among the earliest productions of the printing-press.

The production of prayer-books specially designed for the laity seems to lead naturally to the use of the vernacular. In England, the earliest vernacular prayer-books for the laity are known as the *Primers*, usually described as translations of the *Horae*. The central part of the *Horae* was the Little Office of the Blessed Virgin, to which were added the Dirge, the Penitential psalms and other liturgical texts. A dozen Primer manuscripts dating from 1377 to 1460 have been published, and all these vernacular versions of the *Horae* are entirely liturgical, that of 1460 being one of the shortest rather than containing additions.

An influential section of the laity, however, was anxious to read the liturgical prayers in Latin, and was catered for by the *Horae*. No less than twenty-six editions of the *Sarum Horae* have been listed before 1500. A writer of that period informed us that in England it was a custom with groups of pious laymen to take the *Horae* to church and to recite there together the liturgical hours verse by verse in a low voice "after the manner of churchmen". There is no evidence that this was ever done in the vernacular. The earliest print of the *Sarum Horae* has come down to us in some Caxton fragments of 1477. There are other fragments

of Caxton prints of the *Sarum Horae* dated 1484, 1485, 1489 and 1491, which were all entirely in Latin, though there was probably a 1490 edition with an English appendix, which contained the prayer: "O Jhesu endless swetnes of louyng soules, O Jhesu gostly ioye passyng and excedyng all gladness and desyres", this being the first English prayer ever printed. Also the famous Primer by William of Machlinia (1484) was in Latin.

In 1494 the *Sarum Horae* by Wynkyn de Worde contained the prayers "O blessyd trinyte" and "O Lord god almyghty", and in the same year the *Sarum Horae* printed by Jean Richard de Rouen had the prayers "God haue mercy on all crysten soules", "O glorious iesu" and "The holy body of crist iesu". The first *Sarum Horae* to publish these five vernacular prayers was the Paris print of 1495, and the first edition to have the table of contents in English was that by Jean Richard of 1497. These are the major items in the vernacular inserted into the *Sarum Horae* up to 1500. However, from the 1494 Wynkyn de Worde edition, the *Sarum Horae* frequently had the titles or intentions of the (Latin) prayers in English, such as "These prayers followyng ought for to be sayd on ye departe out of your chambre at your uprysyng", or "When thou goest fyrst out of thi hous, blesse the sayengg thus". The 1494 Jean Richard edition has before the *O intemerata* the prayer: "God haue mercy on all crysten soules. God saue the kyng and bryng us tho the blyss that never shall have endyng", the first English prayer for the king to have appeared in print (in the Paris prints of 1498 the petition for the king was omitted).

The two identical 1498 Paris editions, one (in the British Museum) by Philip Pigouchet, the other (in Trinity College, Dublin) by Jean Poitevin, were the first to have the vernacular prayers so far listed, most of the vernacular titles already found in the earlier editions and the vernacular contents table. With the addition of an "almanach pour xxi ans" these editions were really trilingual.

The interesting point in the development of the *Sarum Horae* prints up to 1500 is that only non-liturgical material, such as was not found at all in the Primers, was given in the vernacular. So far as the liturgical prayers were concerned the reader was either credited with a sufficient knowledge of Latin or expected

to recite them, from the vernacular head-line, in a general intention rather than in detailed comprehension, in very much the same way as at present the people sing the *O salutaris* and *Tantum ergo*.

The vernacular prayers in the early *Sarum Horae* prints are the first examples in English of devotional prayers specially, and privately, compiled by clerics for the use of the laity, and these prayers show already all the characteristics which to this day distinguish devotional from liturgical prayers. Let us consider the shortest of those three major prayers:

O Lord god almyghty, alle seeing, al thinges knowyng, wyse-
don and sapience of al. Ie poure synner make thys day in despite
of the fende [effort] of helle protestation that, if of adventure bi
ony temptaption deception or variacion comyng by sorowe payne
or sekenesse or by ony feblenes of body or by ony other occasion
whatsomeuer it be, I falle or decline en peril of my soule or
preiudyce of my helthe or i error of the holy faith catholike in
which I was regenerate on the holy fonte of baptesme, lord god,
in good minde in whych I hold me nowe by thy grace, wherof
whyth alle my hert I tanke the, to that error whyth my power
I resiste and here renounce and of the same me confesse, in pro-
testyng that I wyll yue and deye in the fayth of holy chyrch our
moder and thin espouse and in witnesse of thys confession and
protestation and in despyte of the fend of helle, I offre to the
credo in whyche alle veryte and trouthe, is conteyned, and to the
I recommede my soule, my feyth, my lyf and my deth. Amen.
Credo in deum.

I have had to change the punctuation to make this prayer generally intelligible; the fantastic punctuation in the Paris prints is one of the many reasons from which we may conclude that the printer had no knowledge of the English language.

Those of our contemporaries who apply the yard-stick of classical Roman collects to all forms of Catholic prayer will not fail to point out to us the long-winded wordiness and rank subjectivism of this prayer. Yet can we fail to recognize that it is this late mediaeval evolution of the flowery beauty of the Gallican liturgy rather than the terseness of the Romans, familiar to us from the liturgy of Lent, that has guided, for the subsequent 450 years, Catholic devotions? The present writer has pointed out

elsewhere that the Primer versions of liturgical prayers are an untapped source of linguistic inspiration to present-day translators of the Missal. It should be added that those early vernacular prayers printed in English prayer-books are venerable land-marks in the development of Catholic devotion in English. In England and even more so in Ireland, private compilations of devotions still hold their place among the people, even at Mass, and the emphatic style and meditative spirit characteristic of the earliest prayers printed in English continues to fulfil a useful and important function, beside the strictly liturgical prayers, in the religious life of all of us.

It has become a fashion to describe such devotional prayers as non-liturgical and therefore inferior. Practically all the indulgenced prayers found in the *Raccolta*, the Church's official collection of private devotions, show the characteristics, in style and spirit, of such prayers as the prayer "O Lord god almyghty". In connexion with the Holy Year it may be of special interest to record that the early *Sarum Horae* prints contain the first indulgenced prayer printed in English: "To them that before thys image of pyte devoutly say v Pater noster, v Aves and a Credo, pytously beholdyng these armes of cristes passion, are granted xxxii. m. vii hondred and lv yers of pardon." This is, to my knowledge, the earliest English contribution to the history of the prayer *En ego*, to this day one of the most highly indulgenced prayers, and indeed the classical example of the distinctively devotional style of Catholic prayers.

The spirit and style of the vernacular prayers inserted in the early *Sarum Horae* prints is typical of the modern mind, complicated, self-conscious and discursive. The relationship between liturgical and devotional prayers in those early prints as in present-day Catholic life is a beautiful illustration of the way in which the Church has been living with her children. In the light of this development the bibliographical and linguistic facts of the early *Sarum Horae* prints become genuine manifestations of the life of the Church. In the historical perspective of the generation living at the end of the fifteenth century and of our own generation such prayers as the prayer "O Lord god almyghty", anticipating all possible temptations to apostasy, are pertinent and significant indeed.

JOHN HENNIG

NOTES ON RECENT WORK

DOGMATIC THEOLOGY

ONE of the most interesting among recent books is *L'Io di Cristo*, by Mgr P. Parente, dean of the theological faculty at Propaganda University in Rome.¹ It is in effect an extremely vigorous and forthright answer to Père Galtier's *L'Unité du Christ*, reviewed in these pages some four years ago, and especially to the third and most original part of it, which tackles the problem of psychological unity in the Word Incarnate.² Those who have read the work of the learned Jesuit theologian will remember that the solution of this arduous question is made by him to turn chiefly on the precise role played by the person in general, and by the Word in particular, in the activity of which the nature is the source. Is this role purely subsistent or is it also dynamic? Evidently it is true that the person acts; *actiones sunt suppositorum*. But does this mean only that the person is the subject to whom we must attribute the activities of which the nature alone is the well-spring? Or does it mean that the person as such exercises a directive influence on those activities? The relevance of this philosophical question to the doctrine of the hypostatic union is obvious; because upon it will depend the answer to the theological question whether the Word, by the very fact of assuming the sacred humanity into personal union with Himself, exerts over His human actions a hegemonic control. If the answer were in the affirmative then the problem of conscious unity in Christ would, as Père Galtier appreciates, be considerably simplified. It would then be possible to see in the Word not only the principle of ontological unity but the principle of psychological unity as well. Unfortunately, however, for any such tidy solution of the problem, Galtier utterly refuses to allow any dynamic function to the person as such. "The person," he writes, "is the substantial link between the two natures but does not, on that title, exercise upon them—and in particular upon the human nature—any sort of action or influ-

¹ Pp. 288. Morcelliana, Brescia. No price.

² THE CLERGY REVIEW, 1947, XXVII, pp. 182-5.

ence; the hypostatic union belongs to the order of substances; there is nothing dynamic about it (*elle n'a rien d'opérateur*). Of itself, and so far as we distinguish it from the divine nature from which it has the whole of its being, the hypostasis, though it is the subject of their operations, is not their formal principle. Hence its union with a human nature has not the effect of communicating to the sacred humanity any new way of acting, knowing or willing. From this point of view, and taking into account only its assumption by the Word, the humanity of Christ is left to its natural resources. . . .¹ To the question, 'What does the person do in Christ?' there is the simplest possible answer. The person does in Christ exactly what the person does in each one of us, that is to say, nothing that is proper to Him outside the natures that are His, and absolutely everything that His two natures do."²

With this view of the function of the person Mgr Parente radically disagrees: "The active hegemony of the person in general, and of the person of the Word in particular, over his own natural activity is an established truth in traditional Catholic theology."³ Indeed, he deduces from the condemnation of Monothelism that "the two wills and activities (in Christ) are combined harmoniously under the influence and hegemonic direction of the one person of the Word".⁴ "Personal unity," he writes, "is inconceivable without the unity of substantial existence and without unity of action, at least from the standpoint of the person as hegemonic principle."⁵ Galtier, he writes again, "denies to the person the function of operative principle and reduces it to a mere subject of attribution. . . . This nullification of personality in the psychological sphere of activity is diametrically opposed to the scholastic teaching, especially to that of St Thomas, who sees in every operation the concurrence of the nature as *principium quo* and the person as *principium quod*, the former along the line of formal causality and the latter along the line of efficient causality. In good philosophy it is not the nature that acts of itself, but the person who, as hegemonic principle, has the initiative of the activity which develops according to the nature."⁶ And elsewhere, "Every human action of

¹ *L'Unité du Christ* (Beauchesne, 1939), p. 262.

² *L'Io di Cristo*, p. 84.

⁴ P. 81.

⁵ P. 172.

³ *Op. cit.*, p. 269.

⁶ P. 170.

Christ is theandric, because it springs from the sacred humanity under the directive influence of the Word."¹

There can be no doubt that, in crediting the person as such with this active influence upon the nature, Mgr Parente finds himself at a great advantage over Père Galtier when he comes to explain the psychological unity of the Word Incarnate: he is in fact able to adopt the neat solution—that the Word makes Christ both ontologically and psychologically one—which the Jesuit theologian finds himself constrained to renounce. Galtier's solution, which invokes the human intellect of Christ enlightened by the beatific vision as the focus of His conscious unity, is at the very best paradoxical, and less likely to gain a sympathetic hearing than is an explanation which, besides having the merit of simplicity, would appear to be more consonant with "the intimate connexion between the *ratio essendi* and the *ratio operandi*".² It is therefore of the first importance that Mgr Parente's claim—that his dynamic view of the function of the person is both true and Thomistic—should be established. Is it true, then, and is it the doctrine of St Thomas, that "the person is not simply a principle of attribution, but also the controlling (*egemonico*) principle of the activity of the nature that is hypostatized in it"?³

At least one Dominican theologian, it would appear, has recently given his support to this view. P. R. Spiazzi, reviewing Mgr Parente's work in *L'Osservatore Romano* (14 April, 1951), writes: "His solution is possible only on the basis of the Thomistic conception of one being (*essere*) in Christ, the foundation and cause of his ontological and dynamic unity; and Mgr Parente, in perfect Thomistic style, devotes to this point some deeply thoughtful pages in which we breathe the purest air of the best theological speculation."

Nevertheless, with all respect to Mgr Parente, with due homage to the erudition for which his work is remarkable, and with deference to his learned reviewer, one may be allowed to question whether this is the true interpretation of Thomistic thought. If the scholastic philosophy stresses the intimate relation between activity and being (*agere sequitur esse*) it is surely, above all, because being is the pre-requisite to activity: "Noth-

¹ P. 179.

² Parente, *op. cit.*, p. 170.

³ *Op. cit.*, p. 137.

ing can act *per se* if it does not subsist *per se*, because nothing acts except what actually exists."¹ Now it is only hypostases that exist, and therefore it is only hypostases that act; hence the axiom *actiones sunt suppositorum; agere est suppositi*. On this point St Thomas is always insistent. Properly speaking, parts do not exist but the whole exists according to its parts; accidents do not exist but the substance exists according to its accidents; the nature does not exist but the hypostasis exists according to its nature.² The same is true of action and therefore, properly speaking, it is not the nature that acts but the person that acts according to the powers and energies that spring from the nature. There is nothing here that permits us to assign to the person as such any peculiarly operative function, nor, consequently, to attribute to the Word as such any controlling influence over His human activity.

Père Hérís, one of the foremost exponents of Thomism in our day, is of the same opinion. "Let us remember," he writes, "that in Christ the human nature is united to the divine nature precisely and only under the aspect of subsistence. There are therefore in Christ two quite distinct activities corresponding to His two natures: a truly divine activity and a truly human activity. But let us beware of conceiving the person as a third and higher activity superimposing itself upon the other two and using them as instruments for His purposes. As a matter of fact, the person is a source of activity only by the nature which enables it to act. As such, and formally considered, the person's sole function is to give to the substance its final achievement in the order of being. Therefore, when we say that the person or the hypostasis acts we mean by this that the concrete nature, the hypostatized nature, acts. But formally speaking this activity has its source in the nature and not in the hypostasis."³ "The role of metaphysical personality," he writes elsewhere, "is not to govern human action. That is the province of intellectual and volitional human consciousness. The second person of the Blessed Trinity knows and wills by His human and by His divine nature; apart from these natures He does not act. He is simply

¹ *Summa Theol.*, I, 75, 2.

² Cf. *Summa Theol.*, III, 17, 2.

³ *Le Verbe Incarné*, Tome III (*Somme Théologique*. Ed. Revue des Jeunes), p. 339.

their principle of subsistence, their principle of unity and being.¹ . . . It is the Word who acts, and the action belongs strictly to Him; He is its subject. The action, however, may come from the divine or from the human nature. In the latter case, there is no reason to look for a special intervention of the Word by which He would take hold of the activity of Christ's human nature and direct it according to His good pleasure. God has only to accord to this activity the usual co-operation that He gives to every action on the part of a creature."²

This, I think it will be agreed, has the authentic Thomistic ring, echoed certainly by Père Galtier and just as certainly not echoed by Mgr Parente. If on the ontological or metaphysical question—what it is that constitutes the person as such—Galtier and Hérís are poles apart, here at any rate Scotist and Thomist speak with one voice: the person as such exercises no controlling influence over the nature and the action of which the nature is the only source.

This, of course, is not to say that the sacred humanity acts in complete independence of the Word. Except for the extreme Molinist, there can be no question of "parallelism" between divine and human activity. Like every human nature the sacred humanity is nothing more than a potential source of operation, which therefore needs to be stimulated into action by God; but in this respect, as Père Hérís rightly points out, "God has only to accord to this activity the usual co-operation that He gives to every action on the part of a creature." Clearly, too, the sacred humanity stands in need of the supernatural stimulus of actual grace, and the impeccability of the Word Incarnate requires that such grace shall be always efficacious. But, again, it is not necessary to see in this divine activity anything more peculiar to the second person of the Blessed Trinity than we do in the divine action by which the three divine persons operate the virginal conception of Christ, create His adorable soul, adorn Him body and soul with the natural and supernatural perfections befitting the sacred humanity, take it up and unite it hypostatically to the Word. Terminatively, by all means, this divine action is proper to the Word; but surely this means nothing more than that the human nature upon which the three

¹ *The Mystery of Christ*, tr. Fahey (Mercier Press), p. 43.

² *Ibid.*

divine persons so act is hypostatically united only to Him. Father and Holy Ghost are acting upon the sacred humanity of the Word, whereas the Word—but by the same divine title—is acting upon a humanity which is His own. Essentially, however, and considered precisely as action, this divine influence does not differ from that which God exercises upon the souls of other men. Here Père Galtier and Père Hérís are in entire agreement. “All we claim for Christ,” writes the latter, “is a more special Providence, a particular governance of God, over His human will to render it worthy of the Word who has assumed it.”¹

Mgr Parente rightly stresses the traditional and valuable doctrine that the sacred humanity is the *instrumentum coniunctum* of the Word.² The Word became man to save us; He used His humanity as the instrument of our salvation. This is a consoling truth which we should do ill to forget; but, equally, we should do ill to misunderstand it. There are indeed certain actions of Christ in which the Word—all three divine persons, in fact—use the sacred humanity for the working of miracles and the conferring of grace, and since here the Word is the subject of the human action as well as the divine they are in Him strictly theandric. Here the Word is truly using His own humanity as *instrumentum coniunctum*. But in His other human actions the Word is no more properly using His sacred humanity as an instrument than I am wielding my human nature as a tool when I act. Admittedly it is often said that a person “uses” his nature and faculties; but this surely means only that nature and faculties are the “*principia quibus agit principium quod*”—and not that the person as such has at his disposal any power of initiative other than that of which the nature is the source. Apart, then, from His miraculous and grace-giving operations the human acts of Christ are generally held to be theandric only in the wider sense, viz. that they are the human acts of a divine person. Nor does any “personal initiative” of the Word, such as Mgr Parente requires, seem to be needed in order to account for “the infinite value of the actions and sufferings of the Word Incarnate”.³ For St Thomas, at any rate, this is sufficiently

¹ *Le Verbe Incarné*, III, p. 341; cf. Galtier, op. cit., p. 283, n. 1.

² Op. cit., p. 179.

³ Op. cit., p. 171.

explained by the fact that they *are* the actions and sufferings of the Word Incarnate: the Word is their subject of attribution, it is to Him that they belong: "... oportuit . . . ut actus satisfaciens haberet efficaciam infinitam, utpote Dei et hominis existens."¹

Perhaps the chief importance of *L'Io di Cristo* lies in having called attention to the question whether it is possible to maintain the dynamic "autonomy" of the humanity of Christ without prejudice to the unity of His person. Mgr Parente holds that it is not, and he hardly disguises his conviction that in holding the contrary Père Galtier is but drawing the logical conclusion of his Scotistic view regarding the essence of personality.² On the other hand we have seen that Père Hérís, who is far from being a Scotist, agrees with Père Galtier that "it is not the role of metaphysical personality to govern human action". What are we to conclude? This at least, that, whatever the merits of Mgr Parente's solution of the psychological problem of Christ, it is not likely to be acclaimed by all theologians as specifically Thomistic.

The absorbing problem of Christ's conscious unity lies outside the immediate purview of St Thomas and also outside that of Père Garrigou-Lagrange, whose Latin treatise on the Incarnation and Redemption has now been published by Herder in an English translation under the title *Christ the Saviour*.³ Like the other works of the author in the same series, this takes the form of a commentary on the text of the *Summa Theologica* and therefore, while enjoying the advantages offered by this method, suffers also from the limitations it imposes. One of the advantages is that the reader is compelled to use the *Summa*; its chief limitation is that without the *Summa* the book is difficult to use. Exception must be made for long disquisitions on the Thomist theory of the hypostatic union, on the "gratia capitis" (where some reference to the Encyclical *Mystici Corporis* might have been apposite), on the knowledge of Christ, and on the famous problem of reconciling His freedom with the divine command to undergo the Passion. But even with the index sup-

¹ *Summa Theol.*, I, 1, 2, ad 2; cf. *Contra Gentes*, 4, 55.

² E.g. *L'Io di Cristo*, pp. 172, 191-2.

³ Tr. by Dom Bede Rose, O.S.B.; pp. 748. (Herder. 67s. 6d.)

plied by the translator it is a labour for any reader who has not a fairly intimate knowledge of the structure of the *Summa* to find the point he is looking for. The work contains, in addition, a compendium of *Mariology*—in effect a synopsis of the same author's *The Mother of the Saviour*¹—and a short chapter on St Joseph. As for the merits of the translation, it has been impossible without access to the Latin original to gauge its accuracy throughout. In one sentence at least, "Contrary to what has been said, there is a real distinction in God between suppositum and nature",² a vital negative appears to be lacking; but in general Dom Bede Rose, though he forfeits elegance by adhering too closely to the Latin construction, seems to have given us a faithful version of the learned Dominican's work.

From the same house of Herder comes a welcome English translation of Scheeben's masterpiece, *The Mysteries of Christianity*.³ It is based on Höfer's 1941 German edition which has the unique merit of embodying faithfully the changes which the author himself, shortly before his death, made in an annotated copy of his original work. It is almost incredible that this book should have been produced by its author at the early age of thirty. He was seventeen when he began to attend lectures at the Gregorian University in Rome, and it is interesting to notice that the professors who influenced him during his course of studies there combined in due proportion the patristic tradition re-born of Petavius with a revival of speculative scholasticism: Passaglia, Franzelin and Kleutgen may serve as examples. Ordained at the age of twenty-three and appointed immediately to teach theology at the seminary of Cologne, he was able seven years later to compose this work which, in the opinion of competent judges, surpasses in theological insight even the three volumes of the *Dogmatik* which he succeeded in completing before his premature death at the age of fifty-two. *The Mysteries of Christianity* is not a theological text-book; it is not an "oeuvre de popularisation"; it is not a treatise of ascetical and mystical theology; least of all is it a series of meditations or "scholia practica" designed to drive home the spiritual lessons of dogmatic theology. In an extraordinary way it combines all these.

¹ See THE CLERGY REVIEW, 1950, XXXIII, pp. 122-3.

² Tr. by Cyril Vollert, S.J. Pp. 834. (Herder. 56s.)

³ P. 123.

It is true that in some matters of detail Scheeben's opinions have not met with universal acceptance. Nevertheless, by a providentially opportune synthesis of positive and speculative thought this youthful theologian succeeded, perhaps beyond any who have come after him, in presenting Christian doctrine, not as merely dogmatic, not as merely moral, ascetical or mystical, but as theology pure and simple: as the story of the relation—fraught with mystery throughout—of the human creature to the Triune God. Scheeben views the Christian revelation as a constellation of mysteries, believing that "just as correct perspective is indispensable to astronomy and the graphic arts, so an accurate determination of the mysterious character of the higher Christian truths is indispensable to an understanding and presentation of the mysteries themselves".¹ He selects nine mysteries to which all the others are reducible: the Trinity, creation and original justice, sin, the Word Incarnate and Redemption, the Eucharist, the Church and the sacraments, Christian justification, glory and final consummation, and, last of all, predestination. Here, in the author's own words, is the guiding principle which should guide the reader in the study of this masterly work: "The incarnate Wisdom of God is the supreme end and object of theology, and the focus of its continually evolving wisdom. . . . Of course the objective centre, the root and the summit of the entire supernatural order is the Triune God, or the bosom of the eternal Father, from which Christ Himself came forth, and to which He returns with His mystical body. But as long as we have not yet entered into the very bosom of the eternal Father, and must be content to behold the invisible in the visible, He himself in His earthly form is the way upon which we must travel in our ascent to that summit. Our theological wisdom, which is at once human and divine, must attach itself to Him primarily in His humanity, in order to scale the heights to His divinity, to His unity with the Father."²

Scheeben intended his book for a wider public than professional theologians. "I have endeavoured," he wrote in his preface to the first edition, "to keep this presentation as simple and clear as possible and hope that even those readers who have

¹ P. 19.

² P. 795.

not had the advantage of philosophical training can follow me without too great effort." Some of his earliest reviewers considered that in striving after simplicity and clearness the author had been less than successful; although there may be much truth in the suggestion that their judgement reflects less discredit on the author's lucidity than upon the state of German theology at the time. However that may be, and judging from a careful study of *The Mysteries of Christianity* in Father Vollert's admirable translation, I am inclined to doubt whether the general public will find it easy reading. The studious among them will profit by it, but it is above all a book for theologians to read and digest. The priest who has completed his normal studies of theology—and how superficial these, even in four years, must necessarily be!—will achieve under Scheeben's guidance a firm grasp and understanding of the whole which no seminary course will have been able to give him. Father Vollert, who contributes a useful index, is indeed to be congratulated upon an excellent translation which makes this invaluable work generally accessible to the English-speaking public.

The Mysteries of Christianity makes comparatively few references to our Lady, but those few are such as to reveal the author's deep understanding of the unique place that Mary holds in the divine plan. Scheeben's *Mariology*, however, did take final shape until he had embarked upon his monumental *Dogmatik*, where it appears as the fifth chapter in his Christology under the significant title "The virginal Mother of God and her relation to the work of redemption". It is this chapter that forms the major part of Scheeben's *Mariology*, translated by Father Geukers and published also by Herder.¹ Perhaps more than any other theologian, Scheeben is responsible for the renewed impulse that Marian theology has received during the past hundred years; and his chief merit lies in having emphasized that Mary is not only the mother of the Redeemer but also His chosen associate; not only mother but also bride and helpmeet. The translation under review may have suffered to some extent from being based on a Flemish version; we cannot say how far this fact may account for numerous discrepancies from the German

¹ Tr. by Rev. T. L. M. J. Geukers. 2 vols.; pp. xxxiv + 252; 287. (Herder. 22s. 6d. per vol.)

original which we have been able to observe; in any case, frequent misprints as well as a somewhat irksome literary style forbid us to recommend this work unreservedly to our readers. Nevertheless, those who are willing to make the necessary effort will find here in a fuller but less clearly defined form the fundamental principles of Scheeben's Mariology which have been set forth more concisely and systematically by Feckes in *The Mystery of the Divine Motherhood*, published, in English as well as in German, by Schöningh of Paderborn.

The transition from Scheeben to Schmaus is an easy one. The illustrious professor of theology at Munich, the second volume of whose *Katholische Dogmatik* (now in its fourth edition) has recently reached us,¹ is a disciple of Scheeben as well as being associated with Höfer in the new edition of his works which Herder is now publishing. To call Dr Schmaus a disciple of Scheeben is not to say that he adopts all his views (in Mariology, for example, he appears not to go so far in his estimate of Mary's part in our redemption); but in his Christocentric presentation of theology and in his general outlook he certainly reveals Scheeben's influence. If the Munich professor is one of the chief exponents in our day of the *Verkündigungstheologie*, Scheeben was its pioneer. To him the problem of opening to the wider circle of the laity the rich content of theological speculation had already presented itself as urgent. Were professional theologians to have a monopoly of the theological wisdom of the ages? I think *The Mysteries of Christianity* was an attempt to solve it, and I have suggested that it was not completely successful. It is the contention of Schmaus that any theology worthy of the name must be "kerygmatic", capable not only of enlightening the mind but also of warming the heart and stimulating the will; it must take the form of a salutary and redemptive message addressed to all men. This is why it must be Christocentric: "ut per hunc in invisibilium amorem rapiamur". There is no suggestion here that technical and speculative theology should be abandoned in favour of a primitive simplicity which the Bible and the Fathers are supposed to offer in its stead. Pope Pius XII, in his Encyclical *Humani generis*, has pointed out the fallacy that

¹ *Gott der Schöpfer und Erlöser*. Pp. xvi + 962. (Max Hueber, Munich. Unbound DM 26.80; half-cloth DM 29.80.)

underlies such a contention. The plea of the kerygmatic theologians would appear rather to be that the accumulated fruits of speculative theology should be progressively integrated into the message we deliver to the faithful. Hence their insistence on Christ as the focus of our thought and on the essentially "theandric" character of our theology: it is the Word Incarnate who brings the divine life down to earth and it is in Him primarily that we must study it. Only so, it is suggested, will the danger be avoided that the theologian may shut himself up in his ivory tower of speculation and, like the Gnostics of the early centuries, regard the "understanding" of revealed truth as the exclusive privilege of a closed circle of initiates. It may be that the Holy Father had this danger in mind when, in the same Encyclical, he wrote that "the study of the hallowed sources of revelation gives the sacred sciences a sort of perpetual youth; avoid the labour of probing deeper and deeper yet into the sacred deposit, and your speculations—experience shows it—grow barren". On the other hand the cult of the kerygmatic has its own dangers; there is in particular the risk of drifting away from the firm anchorage which the dogmatic formulas provide, of adopting manners of speech which the passing fashion may dictate but which, by reason of their lack of precision, may easily distort the doctrines they are intended to convey. Against these dangers Dr Schmaus is on his guard. His skilful combination of the classical theology with the endeavour to translate it into the language of the Christian life is a proof that, if he is convinced that Catholic theology has a message for every man in every age, it is because he sees it as possessing objective and immutable truth. The present volume—of formidable bulk—deals with the creation and elevation of man and with the Incarnation and Redemption. It is in keeping with the general scope and method of the author that we are reminded from the beginning that the Creator is the Triune God; and that His purpose in creating is that there may exist rational beings who will manifest His glory by sharing His inner life and by enjoying the beatific vision. The approach is essentially factual, historical; never for a moment are we allowed to forget that He who creates is three persons and not one only; that in creating man God had in mind the sacred humanity that the Word

would assume; that if man is endowed with intellect it is in order that he may be made capable of sharing the divine life of the Trinity. In other words, the natural is never presented as ultimate—because ultimate, in fact, it never is. In this synthetic and historical view of theology we inevitably turn with interest to the chapter on the relation between the natural and the supernatural. Dr Schmaus begins by pointing out the dangers of the two conceptions (that represented by de Lubac and that of his opponents): the former, if pushed too far, may result in the confusion of the two orders, while the latter may lead to the supposition that nature is self-sufficient. Of the two dangers Dr Schmaus considers the second to be the more urgent at the present day; he then goes on: "The passive attitude of nature to the supernatural should therefore not be overstressed. If the supernatural is something new for nature it is not something foreign to it; it does not do it violence. Nature is not positively opposed to the supernatural as, for example, the unmusical person is to music; such a person is simply incapable of receiving a melody. It is only because nature is capable of receiving the supernatural if offered, only because it possesses an organ for the reception of the supernatural which God bestows upon it, that a real interpenetration of the natural and the supernatural becomes possible."¹

Nothing could be more just. Yet it can hardly be denied that what is in effect a return to St Augustine's strictly factual consideration of man's nature must tend to obscure the real distinction between the natural and the supernatural, a distinction now clearly seen thanks only to the analytical work of the scholastics. This is one reason why the work of Dr Schmaus cannot be recommended—indeed was never intended—as a manual for the novice in theology. Pedagogically, it seems that the analytical approach remains the only safe and practicable method. The synthesis which lights up theology as a whole cannot be understood or even safely attempted until each part of the structure has been patiently assimilated; and this process, the human mind being what it is, requires the method of abstraction or "praecisio" characteristic of the scholastic treatment—a treatment which, though it may lack the vital appeal of works

¹ P. 199.

written for the mature, is justly described by the Holy Father as "unrivalled, either for the instruction of novices, or for the investigation of the most recondite truths". Dr Schmaus's book is a book for the theologian who has completed his course, and he undoubtedly will derive great profit from it.

Dr Doronzo pursues his patient and erudite way through his course of sacramentary theology, having now reached the second of the four volumes he proposes to devote to the sacrament of Penance.¹ As in previous volumes of this monumental series, here too it would appear to be the object of the learned author to provide so much material in the way of citations from the Fathers, theologians and contemporary writers as, almost, to render recourse to any other book unnecessary. No serious student of theology would allow this to be possible. Yet it must be admitted that, the extreme specialist apart, theologians generally will find here so much as to leave them little appetite for more. Dr Doronzo's treatment of Confession (which together with Contrition forms the subject-matter of the present volume) is especially exhaustive and satisfying. He chooses his citations so judiciously that it becomes possible, even for those who have read none of the specialists on the subject, to form a very accurate idea of the famous controversy on public and private penance. In this matter he is not prepared to go so far as Galtier.² While maintaining with him that the public penance customary during the third, fourth and fifth centuries was indeed sacramental, he refuses to allow that absolution was normally deferred until that penance was concluded. The order of events, according to Dr Doronzo, would seem to have been the following: private confession to the priest or bishop; indication of the satisfaction the sinner would have to make; sacramental absolution (either private or public); the sinner was then (so far as the law of the seal allowed it) admitted into the order of penitents, and during the period of his public penance was precluded from communion with the faithful and from the reception of the Eucharist; he then received full reconciliation with the faithful and was re-admitted to Communion by the

¹ *De Poenitentia* Tom. III. *De Contritione; De Confessione*. Pp. 988 + [49]. (Bruce, Milwaukee. Price: \$10.00.)

² See pp. 849-988.

solemn act which terminated the public penance. According to this view the whole process was sacramental, the preceding absolution in regard to the sin itself, and the public penance in regard to the effects and punishment of sin. Clearly, in this account the doctrinal difficulties attending Galtier's view disappear. But it would be unfair to ascribe Dr Doronzo's conclusions to doctrinal considerations alone. In the first place these conclusions are tentative, as they must be in a question so historically obscure and involved; moreover, as he shrewdly observes in answer to the taunts of the positive theologians, "no Catholic need be surprised or suspicious if, in a matter closely connected with a dogma of faith, some concern should be shown for apologetic and dogmatic principles."¹ Finally, the author shows a familiarity with the historical side of this intricate question which makes him more than capable of meeting the positive theologians on their own ground. Here, indeed, Dr Doronzo is at his best.

G. D. SMITH

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

MANUAL OF PRAYERS

Can you give any information about the new edition of this manual, promised when the last edition was withdrawn a few years ago, and also indicate in which books or articles its history may be studied? (N.)

REPLY

i. The only complete account known to us of the origin and history of *The Manual* is by Joseph Gillow, the author of the five-volume *Bibliographical Dictionary of the English Catholics*. It is

¹ P. 946.

a pamphlet of thirty-nine pages reprinted from *The Ushaw Magazine* and published in 1910 by The Westminster Press, 411a Harrow Road, W. Mr Gillow traced its origins to *Precautiones Liturgicae in Dies VII Digestae*, known from the name of its author Simon Verrepé as the *Verrepaeum*, an English translation or adaptation of which appeared first in 1583. Some fifty editions of the book are known to exist, the work being gradually enlarged and transformed by additional matter, but they all retained the series of prayers for each day of the week, which may be taken as the characteristic feature of the book, in the same way as the Little Office of Our Lady is the characteristic of another popular English prayer book *The Primer*. In 1886 the Hierarchy issued a collection of prescribed prayers for congregational use to which was given the existing title *The Manual of Prayers*, although it was not the lineal descendant of the ancient Manual. The 1886 book (and all subsequent editions), being designed for public congregational use, is the only official collection of vernacular prayers current in this country, and though out of print at the moment it retains its official character. Criticism of the 1886 book was not wanting, e.g. faulty translations such as "intestine wars invade our breasts" for "bella premunt hostilia"; or the omission of things which ought to be in and the inclusion of those which ought to be out. One critic explains its unsatisfactory condition by supposing that the then Bishop of Salford entrusted the work to a priest without personally revising it, and that the other bishops appended their own signatures on the understanding that the Bishop of Salford had passed it.¹

ii. The last edition was splendidly produced by Burns Oates & Washbourne in 1942, subsequent to which the following developments occurred and were recorded in the press.

The Times, 12 June, 1943. A statement issued on behalf of the Archbishop of Liverpool: "Owing to the many imperfections which mar a new edition of the "Manual of Prayer", it was decided at a recent meeting of the Hierarchy to buy up the remaining copies of the edition of the publishers. A small committee has been appointed to revise the work, and arrangements will be announced shortly for the return of copies already

¹ *Pastoralia*, January 1907, p. 21.

sold and their replacement by copies of the revised edition as soon as possible."

Catholic Press, 9 July, 1943. The publishers state that copies must not be returned to them "until such time as a further announcement is made by the Hierarchy as to the arrangements made for exchanging the present edition for that being revised".

18 July, 1947. A letter from the secretary of the revisers, Oscott College, Sutton Coldfield, Birmingham, inviting suggestions about the revised edition in preparation.

6 August, 1948. The committee for revising the manual sets out a preliminary draft which is to go before the bishops, and invites the clergy for comments thereon.

If there is any other information on the subject published many of our readers would be interested in hearing about it. In the meanwhile we are all confident that the revision is in good hands and that delay in producing the revised book can only be due to the desire of the committee to secure a standard manual which will be as perfect as possible.

ATTENDANCE AT MASS

The parish priest is taken ill during the 11 a.m. Sunday Mass and is unable to complete it. Is the curate permitted to say Mass not fasting, in order that the people may fulfil their obligation? If not, must he tell the congregation that it is their duty, if possible, to hear Mass elsewhere? (S.)

REPLY

i. In these days when indults for celebrating Mass not fasting are so common, it is our opinion that the view which regarded the fasting law as weightier than the law requiring attendance at Mass should no longer be followed.¹ On this strict view a priest who has broken the fast, even by taking the ablutions at his first Mass, was not permitted to celebrate not fasting solely in order to enable the people to keep the law, but

¹ THE CLERGY REVIEW, 1940, XVIII, p. 65.

only if it was necessary for avoiding scandal, the natural law taking precedence over the positive law. The modern indults, however, permit liquid nourishment before celebrating, but not solid food except in those cases where Mass is celebrated in the afternoon or evening. Applying this practice to the above problem we suggest that the assistant priest may say Mass not fasting provided he has taken no solid food.

ii. The people are bound, in principle, to fulfil their obligation by attending Mass elsewhere, unless excused by the kind of grave reason which altogether releases them from keeping the positive law. We suggest as the solution to the second problem that, if the assistant priest knows that Mass can easily be attended in the neighbourhood, he should inform the congregation of their obligation; otherwise he should say nothing about the matter at all, in order to leave as many as possible in good faith; they will rely on the fact that they have come to Mass and are unable, through no fault of their own, to fulfil the obligation of assisting at Mass in that church.

iii. If the parish priest's illness occurs after the consecration, there is hardly any problem to solve: the assistant priest not only may but must complete the sacrifice, even after taking solid food.

LEGITIMACY BY SUBSEQUENT MARRIAGE

Is the offspring rendered legitimate by subsequent marriage in the two following instances? (1) The offspring was born of a marriage invalid owing to difference of worship, but the impediment was removed by baptism and the marriage revalidated after birth; (2) the offspring was born of a marriage invalid owing to *ligamen*, but the previous marriage was declared null and void by an ecclesiastical court after birth and the parties to the second union became validly married. (X.)

REPLY

Canon 1051: Per dispensationem super impedimento dirimente concessam sive ex potestate ordinaria, sive ex potestate

delegata per indultum generale, non vero per rescriptum in casibus particularibus, conceditur quoque eo ipso legitimatio prolis, si qua ex iis cum quibus dispensatur iam nata vel concepta fuerit, excepta tamen adulterina et sacrilega.

Canon 1116: Per subsequens parentum matrimonium sive verum sive putativum, sive noviter contractum sive convalidatum, etiam non consummatum, legitima efficitur proles, dummodo parentes habiles extiterint ad matrimonium intra se contrahendum tempore conceptionis, vel praegnationis, vel nativitatis.

Code Commission, 6 December, 1930; *THE CLERGY REVIEW*, 1931, I, p. 430: An vi canonis 1116 per subsequens parentum matrimonium legitima efficiatur proles, ab eisdem genita de-tentis impedimento aetatis vel disparitatis cultus, quod cessa-verit tempore initi matrimonii? *Resp.* Negative.

Canon 1069, §2: Quamvis prius matrimonium sit irritum aut solum qualibet ex causa, non ideo licet aliud contrahere, antequam de prioris nullitate aut solutione legitime et certo constiterit.

ad 1. The reply of the Code Commission occasioned some surprise and a more generous solution was expected in many quarters,¹ on analogy with the rule of canon 1051.

ad 2. The above reply does not necessarily affect the second query, and it might be thought that, since the first marriage was subsequently declared to be non-existent, the parties were actually free to marry and the benefit of canon 1116 could be extended to their progeny after obtaining a declaration of nullity. We cannot find the point discussed, but in our view legitimization does not occur in this case because persons who have contracted marriage, even though it is certainly invalid owing to a defective consent, are not *habiles* (canon 1116) for contracting a second until the first has been disposed of lawfully and certainly (canon 1069). Legitimacy is a matter for the external forum and must be decided on external rules: in this case, before the first marriage may be disregarded in the external forum, an ecclesiastical process of nullity is required.

¹ *Periodica*, 1930, p. 26, and 1931, p. 150.

ASSISTANT'S APPOINTMENT "AUDITO PAROCHO"

Consultation with the parish priest before an assistant is assigned to him is unusual in this country, there being presumably a custom to the contrary. In places where there is no such contrary custom is the appointment *inaudito parrocho* invalid? (W.)

REPLY

Canon 476, §3: Non ad parochum, sed ad loci Ordinarium, audito parrocho, competit ius nominandi vicarios cooperatores e clero saeculari.

Canon 105: Cum ius statuit Superiorem ad agendum indigere consensu vel consilio aliquarum personarum: l. Si consensus exigatur, Superior contra earundem votum invalide agit; si consilium tantum, per verba, ex. gr.: *de consilio consultorum*, vel *audito Capitulo, parrocho*, etc., satis est ad valide agendum ut Superior illas personas audiat; quamvis autem nulla obligatione teneatur ad eorum votum, etsi concors, accedendi, multum tamen, si plures audiendae sint personae, concordibus earundem suffragiis deferat, nec ab eisdem, sine praevalenti ratione, suo iudicio aestimanda, discedat;

S.C. Conc., 13 November, 1920; *A.A.S.*, XIII, p. 43: "In archidioecesi Zagabriensi habetur consuetudo centenaria nominandi vicarios cooperatores *inaudito parrocho*. Consuetudo orta est ob penuriam sacerdotum et ob expeditiorem administrationis modum. Quaeritur: utrum huiusmodi consuetudo tolerari possit? *Resp.* Standum dispositioni codicis, c. 476, §3.

i. The words *audito parrocho* are all that remain in our modern law of the more ancient principle that it is for the parish priest to make the appointment, a principle sustained by the Council of Trent¹ which empowered the bishops, whenever necessary, to compel parish priests to appoint assistants. Since that time the law has progressively and very decisively favoured the bishops, so that by the end of the nineteenth century it was customary

¹ Sess. xxi, c. 4 de ref.; Waterworth, p. 147.

nearly everywhere for the bishops to nominate the assistants, a custom which the canonists on the eve of the Code agreed was a lawful one. The Code canonized the existing custom whilst preserving merely a relic of the parish priest's ancient right in the words *audito paroko* of canon 476.

ii. The observance of this clause is held by some to be necessary for the validity of an appointment¹ and by others, with whom we agree,² to be unnecessary. Whatever view is favoured, it is agreed that the validity of the subsequent acts of the assistant priest cannot be questioned.³

iii. The only point remaining for discussion is whether the clause *audito paroko*, which in the common law is to be observed at least for the lawfulness of an episcopal appointment, has itself disappeared in many places owing to its abolition by a contrary custom. The reply, 13 November, 1920, which confirms the common law in the Archdiocese of Zagreb, must be limited to that place alone. As explained in the "animadversions" issued with the reply, a custom of not consulting the parish priest is nowhere reprobated in the Code, and may therefore be tolerated from canon 5; it was held, however, that the Ordinary of that place, from the fact of his raising the question, judged that this contrary custom could be corrected, and the reply accordingly confirmed the common law against the contrary custom. Michiels states that he has seen a reply of the same Congregation, sent to the Bishop of Seckau, 8 June, 1927, which was in a sense contrary to that given to the Archbishop of Zagreb in 1920.⁴ Our conclusion is that it is for the Ordinary of each place to make a decision whether the custom, if it exists, should cease. Actually, from the parish priest's point of view, the question is not of great consequence, for the common law of the Code permits the Ordinary to make the appointment after hearing the parish priest, even though an assistant is unwelcome to him. But would anyone criticize those parish priests who firmly maintain the rights given to them in the common law, unless it is certainly established that local custom has abolished them?

¹ e.g. Ojetti in *Jus Pontificium*, 1927, p. 13.

² Boudinhon, pp. cit. 1928, p. 28; *THE CLERGY REVIEW*, 1940, XVIII, p. 67.

³ Canons 15 and 209.

⁴ Quoted in *l'Ami du Clergé*, 1948, p. 318. This article and an earlier one, 1926, p. 504, should be studied by those interested in the legal points involved.

VESPERE AUTEM SABBATI

The restored office of the paschal vigil provides for the exclusion of Vespers which in the Missal office concludes the Mass of Saturday morning. Since the Mass now concludes about 1 a.m., it seems unsuitable to have the antiphon *Vespere autem sabbati* for the Communion antiphon of this Mass. Why was it retained? (C.)

REPLY

Matthew xxviii, 1, the Vulgate used for this antiphon in the current Missal: *Vespere autem Sabbati quae lucescit in prima Sabbati*.

The explanation given by Dr Bugnini¹ is twofold. In the first place the Vulgate of Matthew xxviii, 1, is a faulty translation of Greek the (δψε) which has primarily an adverbial meaning and would be more correctly translated into Latin "Sabbato transacto, die sequenti: i.e. prima die hebdomadae, valde diluculo". Mgr Knox renders the passage thus: "On the night after the Sabbath, at the hour when dawn broke on the first day of the week." The Vulgate of the Missal is retained in the new paschal office because, at least for the time being and pending the revision of liturgical extracts from holy scripture, it is read any way in the Gospel of the Mass. In the second place the words could not be changed easily without altering the plainsong melody, and it was undesirable to anticipate in this one place alone the revision of the words.

PRIEST MINISTER OF CONFIRMATION—
ADMINISTRATOR

An administrator of a vacant parish, *vicarius oeconomicus*, is amongst those empowered by *Spiritus Sancti munera* to confirm the dying. Does this mean the one mentioned in canon 472.2, or are the powers restricted to the one defined in canon 472.1? (L.)

¹ *Ephemerides Liturgicae*, Supplement to fasc. 1, 1951, p. 42.

REPLY

Canon 472: Vacante paroecia: 1. Ordinarius loci in ea quamprimum constituat idoneum vicarium oeconomum . . . qui eam tempore vacationis regat, assignata eidem parte fructuum pro congrua sustentatione;

2. Ante oeconomi constitutionem, paroeciae regimen, nisi aliter provisum fuerit, assumat interim vicarius cooperator. . . .

Spiritus Sancti munera, 14 September, 1946; THE CLERGY REVIEW, 1947, XXVII, p. 57: . . . facultas tribuitur conferendi sacramentum Confirmationis . . . sequentibus presbyteris, iisdemque dumtaxat: . . . (b) vicariis de quibus in canone 471, atque vicariis oeconomis.

1. The wording of the document seems to require us to limit the power of confirming to the administrator appointed by the Ordinary, as directed by canon 472.1. If the various provisional custodians mentioned in n. 2 of the canon are also given this power, the decree would have read: "vicariis de quibus in cann. 471 and 472"; whereas it mentions only the *vicarii paroeciales* of canon 471 and *vicarii oeconomi*. The term *vicarius oekonomus* is restricted to n. 1 of canon 472, and the various priests who are to assume the custody of a parish in n. 2 are described as functioning "ante oeconomi constitutionem". The word "dumtaxat" emphasizes the fact that only the priests mentioned enjoy the faculty, and everyone is agreed that the list may not be extended solely because there seems to be a good reason for so doing, or because there is a certain analogy between those expressly mentioned and some other priest whom it is desired to include. The list will, no doubt, be extended in course of time, either by indult or by an extensive interpretation officially given to those already named therein, but for the moment, in our view, the custodian of canon 472.2 is not included. This view is held by Zerba, *Commentarius*, p. 49 (h); Pistoni, *De Confirmatione* §99; *The Jurist*, 1947, p. 178.

2. Onclin, however, in *Ephemerides Theologicae Lovanienses*, 1949, p. 340, includes the custodian of canon 472.2, and his view is shared by Regatillo, *Jus Sacramentarium*, §86, because the priest in n. 2, though not styled *vicarius oekonomus*, is effectively

such, the only difference between him and the one in n. 1 being that n. 1 is appointed *ab homine* and n. 2 *a iure*. This view which is, it appears, that of the minority, may be accepted if desired. For the difference of opinion on the point constitutes a *dubium iuris* which, in our opinion, is covered by canon 209. Unhappily, there is no complete agreement on the lawfulness of applying canon 209 to doubts affecting the extraordinary minister, because it involves the debated question concerning the exact nature of this priestly power obtained by indult. That canon 209 may be used in solving doubts is taught, correctly we think, by Dr Onclin, a Belgian canonist of the first rank. Unless an instruction to the contrary has been given by local Ordinaries, priests may accept this view. It means, in practice, that on the death of the parish priest, his senior curate may administer confirmation to those dying within the parish, until an administrator is appointed by the Ordinary. This question is only one of a number of doubts arising from the decree *Spiritus Sancti munera*, which is lacking precision in certain phrases.

E. J. M.

ROMAN DOCUMENT
THE BLESSED PIUS X
LITTERAE APOSTOLICAE

QUIBUS

VENERABILIS DEI FAMULUS

PIUS PAPA X

BEATUS RENUNTIATUR

PIUS PP. XII

AD PERPETUAM REI MEMORIAM

(*L'Osservatore Romano*, 4-5 June, 1951)

Quoniam "Christus dilexit Ecclesiam et seipsum tradidit pro ea ut illam sanctificaret" (Ephes. v, 25), numquam defuerunt nec

desse poterunt, inter Christifideles, qui ceteros virtutum laude ita antecedant ut eorum exempla ad imitandum proponantur. Hinc omni tempore Sanctorum atque Beatorum nobilissimum agmen quasi turba magna "quam dinumerare nemo *potest* ex omnibus gentibus et tribubus et linguis" (Apoc. vii, 9), scilicet cuiusque aetatis et conditionis viri et mulieres qui Sponsae Christi pulchritudinem augere et laetitiam multiplicare, usque ad consummationem saeculi, non desinent. Cui fulgidissimo agmini etiam Nobis, qui, licet immeriti, in tanto rerum discrimine, Petrianae navis gubernacula tractamus, benignissimus Dominus dedit, praesertim Anno Sacro proxime elapso, multos addere praeclarissimos heroës, quorum triumphos magno celebravimus animi Nostri gaudio. At suavissimae Dei clementiae placuit Christi in terris Vicario hodie talem conferre gratiam, qualis a duobus amplius saeculis, id est ab anno MDCCXII, quo Pius V in Sanctorum canonem a Clemente XI relatus fuit, nemini ex Decessoribus Nostis est concessa: alium nempe Pontificem Summum in Beatorum numerum referendi: Pontificem, quem Nos ipsi cognovimus, cuius virtutes eximias propius admirati sumus, cui operam Nostram studiosa atque devota dedimus voluntate: Pium dicimus huius nominis Decimum.

Qui natus est in humili pago, cui vulgo nomen "Riese", intra fines Dioecesis Tarvisinae, die II mensis Iunii, anno MDCCCXXXV, ex Ioanne Baptista Sarto et Margarita Sanson, tenuioris quidem fortunae sed honestate et antiqua virtute praestantibus, quos Deus decem sepsit filiorum corona. Insequenti die lustralibus aquis ablutus, nomen habuit Iosephum Melchiorem. Puerulus vividae et laetae indolis, tamen pietatis flore, piissima matre magistra, ita excelluit ut oppiduli curio non dubitaret illum "nobilissimam animam" suae parociae appellare. Post elementorum ludum in natali loco celebratum, maiore discendi studio impulsus, ut scholas ordinis superioris frequentaret, cotidie per quattuor annos, saepe nudis pedibus, proximum oppidum Castrum Francorum petebat. Sacramento Confirmationis die I mensis Septembris, anno MDCCCXLV, roboratus ac prima Eucharistica Communionem die VI mensis Aprilis, anno MDCCCXLVII, refectus, cum ad ecclesiasticam vitam amplectendam propensam voluntatem constanter ostenderet, anno MDCCCL, mense Septembri, clericali veste, ut ardentissime optaverat, indui meruit; et mense Novembri, favente Patre Cardinali Iacobo Monico, Venetiarum Patriarcha atque municipe suo, inclitum Patavinum Seminarium, magno gaudio perfusus, ingressus est. Quantum ibidem pietate et doctrina profecerit, ex moderatorum illius sacri ephebei testimonio facile deduci potest: "*disciplina nemini secundus, ingenii*

maximi, memoriae summae, spei maximae" (ex tabulario Sem. Patav.). Praesagium plenissime confirmarunt eventus. In templo enim principe Castri Francorum die xviii mensis Septembris, anno MDCCCLVIII, sacerdotali dignitate auctus, aliquot post dies, in natali oppido summa cum laetitia, necessariis suis, meritissima matre in primis, atque popularibus omnibus gestientibus, Sacrum Sollemne primum peregit et mense Novembri humilis loci *Tumboli* Parocho religiosissimo at exigua valetudine praepedito, adiutor datus est.

Statim et venerandus ille curio et ruricolae illius paroeciae iuvenis huius sacerdotis egregias dotes, humilitatem, paupertatem, festivam indolem, studium assiduum omnibus quomodocumque opitulandi, contionandi insuper peritiam singularem experti et admirati sunt. Quas virtutes compertus Episcopus Tarvisinus, anno MDCCCLXVII, Iosephum Sarto ad regendam frequentiore paroeciam Saltiani elegit, ubi magis in dies apparuit quanta in Deum et proximos caritate animus Servi Dei flagraret, quanta morum suavitate, mansuetudine, modestia, paupertatis studio excelleret, praesertim luctuosissima lue, anno MDCCCLXXIII, grassante.

Novem annis ibidem transactis. Cathedralis Ecclesiae Tarvisinae Canonicus, Episcopalis Curiae Cancellarius ac pietatis magister Clericorum Seminarii renuntiatus, haec honorifica simul et gravia munera, quae, ab honoribus ac dignitatibus toto pectore abhorrens, tantum ex oboedientia acceperat, otii, ut semper, acerrimus osor, consueta navitate et sollertia adimplevit; adeo ut, anno MDCCCLXXIX, Tarvisina Sede vacante, cunctis suffragiis Vicarius Capitularis electus fuerit. Quo etiam in officio exsequendo talia dedit prudentiae et dexteritatis documenta, ut anno MDCCCLXXXIV, omnibus plaudentibus, ipso tamen invito et frustra renitente, Mantuae Episcopus dictus fuerit.

In hac Alma Urbe, ad S. Apollinaris, die xvi mensis Novembris consecratus, et Dioecesim mense Aprili anni insequentis, ingressus, statim novo sibi commissio mystico gregi generosi animi sui thesauros largius profundere coepit, "omnibus omnia factus" (1 Cor. ix, 22), ut omnes Christo lucrificeret et Mantuanae Ecclesiae multis ac magnis necessitatibus provideret. Recondendum in primis eius, uti res postulabat, inflammatum studium ut adulescens Clerus, pro rerum ac temporum adiunctis, recte institueretur, ut in catholicis consociationibus actio promoveretur et sacrae liturgiae decus augeretur. Hinc sublatae simultates, vitia saepe inveterata radicitus evulsa, scandala premissa, ea invecta quae ad Decalogi praecepta pertinent; mirifice fides aucta, roborata morum honestas. Quid igitur mirum, si apud Mantuanos cives Episcopus Iosephus Sarto pie ac

sancte audierit, quippe qui, flammescende tantum caritate Christi actus, pauperum turmis non modo stipem ubertim suppeditare, dapes praebere, vestes attribuere, verum etiam pedes flexis genibus deosculari soleret?

In Consistorio die xii mensis Iunii, anno MDCCCXCIII, habito, Leo Pp. XIII, rec. mem., qui Episcopum Mantuanum in magna habebat aestimatione et singulari amplectebatur amore, inter Patres Cardinales eum adnumeravit et post triduum amplissimae Ecclesiae S. Marci Venetiarum Patriarcham praefecit, ut clare pateret non tantum Sedi, etsi permagnae, sed potius viro meritissimo Romanae Purpurae honorem dari.

Mirabilis urbs, Hadriatici maris Regina, quae novum Patriarcham diu desideraverat, illum summo gaudio et universali plausu die xxiv mensis Novembris, anno MDCCCXCIV, excepit statimque omnis ordinis Venetiarum incolae eius humanitate ac virtute capti sunt. Et revera, si vestes et quae novae dignitatis erant propria excipias, nihil in Famuli Dei moribus et consuetudine vitae mutatum reperias. Eadem humilitas et despectus sui, idem paupertatis et laboris amor, idem gloriae Dei et animabus aeternae salutis procurandae ardentissimum et constans studium.

Ut Mantuae, ita et Venetiis in primis Cleri disciplinae instaurandae et sanctitati fovendae operam dedit; populi pietatem et christianarum virtutum cultum renovare et augere: divinorum rituum decorem, cantum ecclesiasticum in pristinam dignitatem revocare; mores corrigere, abusus pellere, iura Ecclesiae vindicare suaviter ac fortiter studuit.

Leone XIII, immortalis memoriae, e vivis sublato, anno MCMIII, Cardinalis Iosephus Sarto, die iv mensis Augusti, eodem anno, evectus est ad apicem Summi Pontificatus, quem reluctans, cum lacrimis, suscepit "in crucem", sibi nomen imponens Pii Decimi. In Beati Petri Cathedra constitutus, quid Religionis bonum, quid tempora postularent intuens, hanc pergrandem sane et insignem Pontificatus sui notam futuram edixit: *instaurare omnia in Christo*. Famulo autem Dei, qui experiendo noverat vix quicquam ad hominum in Christo restorationem efficacius esse quam sanctam Clericorum vitam, nulla potior cura fuit, quam ut ii omnes, qui in sortem Domini vocati essent, pietate, oboedientia ac scientia prae ceteris eminent.

Hinc primis Encyclicis Litteris "E supremi" sacricolis animum suum pandere voluit, eos vehementer hortatus, ut quae sursum sunt saperent, quae sursum sunt quaerent. Seminaria Italiae praecipuis curis complectens, novo ordine composuit iisque altioribus quoque divinarum humanarumque rerum studiis magnum attulit incre-

mentum: christianae philosophiae cultores ad pugnandum pro veritate, Aquinate duce, excitavit: studiis Rei Biblicae provehendis Athenaeum in Urbe instituit, ac, quinquagesimo Sacerdotii sui anno redeunte, Clerum universum ad sacra suscepti muneris officia diligenter servanda, suavissima exhortatione concitavit. Ecclesiae leges, per multa volumina dispersas, in unum corpus, temporum conditionibus accommodatum, redegit, et ut negotiorum expeditio celerior fieret, Romanam Curiam novis institutis ordinavit.

De sempiterna animorum salute maxime sollicitus, christianam catechesim pueris et adultis rite tradendam curavit: rectam rationem de rebus divinis dicendi instituit; artem musicam maiestati Sacrorum convenienter servire iussit. Sanctimoniae fautor, divina caritate adspirante, caelestis epuli frequentiore, immo cotidianum usum invexit atque ut pueri inde a tenella aetate ad Sacram Synaxim accederent vehementer hortatus est; in omnibus praeterea Ecclesiae filiis impensorem in SS. Eucharistiae Sacramentum amorem aluit incenditque. Magister inerrans fidei, doctrinas omnium errorum portenta renovantes, insignibus Encyclicis Litteris "Pascendi" detexit ac necessario rigore repressit.

Acerissimus Religionis vindex ac libertatis Christi Ecclesiae fortissimus custos, *civile Veto*, quod dicitur, in electione Romani Pontificis, pro pastoralis officii sui conscientia, reiecit: leges de civitatibus ab Apostolica Sede scindendis seu separandis impavide repudiavit: Galliae, magna afflictione laboranti, novos Episcopos dedit, et pravorum hominum erumpentem audaciam compescuit. Ad Religionis praesidium collapsam Actionis Catholicae disciplinam restituit, restitutamque firmavit: Catholicorum sociali actioni novam formam praescripuit, novaque munera praefinivit: opificum consociationes in viam religiosam sapientissimis legibus direxit opportunioribusque Iuris sanctionibus Religiosorum Ordines communivit.

Ad christianam fidem promovendam et praeservandam novas in Urbe paroecias erexit et paroecialem vitam omnibus modis fovit auxitque: universis Dioecesium necessitatibus prospexit: novis praecorum Evangelii missionibus christianum nomen dilatavit; ut dissidentes Orientales ad unitatem Ecclesiae revocaret, omne adhibuit studium, ac vere pauperum amantissimus Pater orphanorumque adiutor, quibusvis populis sui calamitatibus consulere numquam desiit.

Non labore victus, sed acerbissimo dolore attritus ob infaustum saevumque Europaeum illis diebus exortum bellum, die xv mensis Augusti, anno MCMXIV, aegrotare coepit morboque velociter ingravesciente, die xix ad extremum deductus est. Omnibus Ecclesiae

Sacramentis roboratus, vicesima die eiusdem mensis mortalem vitam cum aeterna placidissime commutavit, Catholico orbe complorante et Sanctum statim illum conclamante, quasi primam ac nobilissimam immanis belli iam furentis victimam. Sollemnibus exsequiarum rite in Basilica Vaticana absolutis, die xxiii mensis Augusti, in Sacris Cryptis, ubi vivens sibi sepulturam elegerat, conditus est. Nominis vero Catholici gentes, eum statim propter eximias virtutes, quibus nomen suum ornaverant deprecatores habuerunt apud Divinam Maiestatem.

Idcirco plures Purpurati Patres, Sacrorum Antistites, Vicarii et Praefecti Apostolici, pia consociationes ac praesertim sodalicia ab Actione Catholica appellata, Catholicae studiorum Universitates et Christifideles ex ordine laicorum, impensis precibus hanc Sedem Apostolicam rogaverunt ut inclito illi christianae familiae Parenti Beatorum Caelitum honores decernerentur. Quam quidem percrebrescentem famam sanctimoniae Deus quoque signis caelestibus visus est confirmare.

Itaque post processus, ordinaria potestate institutos, Causa de Venerabili Servo Dei Pio Pp. X in Beatorum album ascribendo apud Sacram Rituum Congregationem agi coepta est, cuius introductionis Commissionem Nos die duodecima mensis Februarii, anno millesimo nongentesimo quadragésimo tertio, manu Nostra signavimus. Omnibus deinde iis absolutis quae in huiusmodi iudicio fuerant pertractanda, inita est disceptatio de virtutibus sive theologalibus sive cardinalibus Famuli Dei, quas, post acres investigationes probationesque ac sueta comitia, lato decreto die tertia mensis Septembris eiusdem anni, ad gradum heroicum pervenisse Nos ediximus. Cum postea exerceretur quaestio de miraculis quae, Venerabili illo Ecclesiae Pastore deprecante, a Deo ferebantur patrata, ac de quibus in Congregationibus Anteparaepratoria, Praepratoria et denique Generali, die trigesima mensis Ianuarii, anno millesimo nongentesimo quinquagesimo primo, coram Nobis habita, actum est, Nos, omnibus rebus perpensis de duobus, edito decreto die undecima mensis Februarii eodem hoc vertente anno, pronuntiavimus constare.

Una superfuit disquisitio, an Famulus Dei inter Beatos Caelites tuto foret recensendus; quod quidem dubium propositum est a Venerabili Fratre Nostro Clemente Sanctae Romanae Ecclesiae Cardinali Micara, Episcopo Veliterno, Sacrae Rituum Congregationis Pro-Praefecto et Causae Ponente seu Relatore, in Generali Conventu, die vicesima eiusdem mensis et anni coram Nobis celebrato. Omnes autem, qui adfuerunt, cum Patres Cardinales Sacris

tuendis Ritibus praepositi tum Praelati Officiales Patresque Consultores cunctis suffragiis id affirmaverunt.

Nos tamen pro rei magnitudine mentem distulimus aperire quo ad tam gravem ferendam sententiam supernum adiumentum, enixis precibus ad Deum admotis, amplius Nobis obveniret. Itaque, die tandem quarta mensis Martii, anno millesimo nongentesimo quinquagesimo primo, accitis memorato Cardinali Sacrae Rituum Congregationis Pro-Praefecto et Causae Relatore, Venerabili Fratre Alfonso Carinci, Seleuciensi in Isauria titulo Archiepiscopo et Supremi Consilii Sacris Ritibus praepositi Viro a secretis, necnon dilecto filio Salvatore Natucci, Fidei Promotore Generali, post Eucharisticum Sacrum pie celebratum, ad Venerabilis Famuli Dei Pii Pp. X sollemnem Beatificationem *tuto* procedi posse declaravimus.

Quae cum ita sint, Nos, universae Ecclesiae Catholicae vota implentes, harum Litterarum vi atque auctoritate Nostra Apostolica, facultatem facimus ut Venerabilis Dei Servus Pius Pp. X *Beati* nomine in posterum nuncupetur, eiusque corpus ac lipsana, seu reliquiae, non tamen in sollemnibus supplicationibus deferenda, publicae Christifidelium venerationi proponantur, atque etiam ut eiusdem Beati imagines radiis decorentur. Praeterea eadem Nostra auctoritate concedimus ut de illo quotannis recitetur Officium de Communi unius Summi Pontificis cum lectionibus propriis per Nos approbatis, et Missa de eodem Communi cum oratione propria approbata celebretur, iuxta Missalis et Breviarii Romani rubricas. Huiusmodi autem Officii recitationem Missaeque celebrationem fieri dumtaxat largimur in Dioecesibus Tarvisina, cuius intra fines Beatus ipse ortus est, Mantuana et Venetiarum, in quibus Sacrorum Antistitis munere sancte est perfunctus, ac demum Romana, in qua ut Ecclesiae Catholicae Episcopus ac gregis christiani Summus Pastor diem obiit supremum, ab omnibus Christifidelibus qui horas canonicas recitare teneantur et, quod ad Missas attinet, a presbyteris omnibus, tam e saeculari quam e religioso Clero, ad templa seu sacella, in quibus Beati ipsius festum agatur, convenientibus.

Denique largimur ut sollemnia Beatificationis Venerabilis Pii Pp. X, servatis servandis, in supra dictis templis seu sacellis celebrentur, diebus legitima auctoritate designandis, intra annum postquam sollemnia eadem in Sacrosancta Patriarchali Basilica Vaticana fuerint peracta. Non obstantibus Constitutionibus atque Ordinationibus Apostolicis ac Decretis de non cultu editis, ceterisque quibuslibet contrariis. Volumus autem ut harum Litterarum exemplis, etiam impressis, dummodo manu Secretarii Sacrae Rituum Congregationis subscripta sint atque eiusdem Congregationis sigillo

munita, in iudicialibus quoque disceptationibus eadem prorsus fides adhibeatur, quae Nostrae voluntatis significationi, hisce ostensis Litteris, haberetur.

Datum Romae, apud Sanctum Petrum, sub anulo Piscatoris, die III mensis Iunii, Dominica infra Octavam Sacratissimi Cordis Iesu, anno MCMLI, Pontificatus Nostri tertio decimo.

PIUS PP. XII

BOOK REVIEWS

Dear Seminarian. By Catherine de Hueck. Pp. 87. (Bruce, Milwaukee. \$1.75.)

THE author of this small book, Mrs Catherine de Hueck Doherty, is the foundress of Friendship House to minister to the poor in slum areas in North America. The first Friendship House was opened in Toronto in 1931. Since then houses have been established in Harlem, Chicago, Ottawa, and Washington, D.C. The life-story of the author reads like a romance. It is the story of a Russian baroness, exiled by the Reds, doing menial work in New York for a living, then rising to affluence through her ability as a lecturer, and finally sacrificing all for the sake of the poor whose life she had shared and whom she could not forget. Friendship House is the outcome of her experience and her devotion; so too is *Restoration*, a magazine dedicated to social reform, which she founded with her husband, Eddie Doherty, whom she married in 1943 and who intimately shares her ideals.

Dear Seminarian is a kind of sequel to *Dear Bishop*, in which she explained to the American Hierarchy the needs of the poor as she had come to understand them from twenty years of experience and investigation. *Dear Seminarian* consists of fifteen letters containing the answers which Mrs Doherty has given, on the advice of a certain prelate, to the many seminarians who have written to her for advice on the Lay Apostolate of Catholic Action. The letters give advice from the pews; and "much good and salutary advice," writes Bishop W. J. Smith of Pembroke in his Preface, "can come from those who sit in the pews".

The subjects dealt with in the letters include prayer, especially the Mass; the need for a priest to be seen often among his people and to be approachable; the value of spiritual direction; the ministry of the pulpit; the love of social justice; the need to teach the fullness of the Gospel; the promotion of sodalities, study clubs, etc.; Catholic Action cells; the corporal and spiritual works of mercy; the priest *alter Christus*; the training of youth; lay apostles.

The letters are brightly written and to the point. The author has great zeal and equally great understanding of the social problem, of Communism and of the lofty vocation and universal influence of the priest.

The Gifts of the Holy Ghost. By John of St Thomas. Translated by Dominic Hughes, O.P. With a Foreword by Walter Farrell, O.P. Pp. ix + 293. (Sheed & Ward. 16s.)

JOHN of St Thomas has been recognized, from the first, as one of the foremost interpreters of St Thomas. He was born in Lisbon of an Austrian father and a Portuguese mother. But almost the whole of his active life was spent in Spain; he became a Dominican at Madrid at the age of twenty-three, was for many years professor at Alcala, and was so highly esteemed for his wisdom and prudence that towards the end of his life, he was appointed confessor to Philip IV. His commentary on the *Summa Theologica* was the outcome of twenty years of lecturing. He died before he could complete it; but among the completed parts was the treatise on the Gifts of the Holy Ghost, here translated into English for the first time in its entirety.

Fr Dominic Hughes, of the Dominican House of Studies at Washington, is named as the translator, but Fr Mark Egan, O.P., of the Angelicum, has apparently helped him in the work. They have succeeded admirably in what must have been a very difficult task. John of St Thomas is not the easiest of writers. Although he had studied the humanities under the distinguished tutorship of the Jesuits of Coimbra, he displays on the whole none of the graces of style which many of his great contemporary theologians adopted. He made clarity his one aim, and to it he sacrificed even grammatical propriety at times. But his presentation is vigorous, and his gift of apt illustration and comparison is remarkable.

The treatment of the Gifts in our manuals of Dogmatic Theology is generally very summary. It is to the speculative writers on Mystical Theology that one must go for a more detailed and adequate discussion, because the part played by the Gifts, especially the Gift of Wisdom, in the higher stages of contemplation is so vital that it

must be dwelt on at some length. To these writers John of St Thomas is a very competent guide. Not all, of course, will follow him unquestioningly; he is a Thomist of the Thomists.

But all must recognize the completeness and the coherence of his treatment. He treats of the Gifts in Sacred Scripture, and of the distinction between the Gifts and the Virtues; he surveys each Gift at length, discusses the essential distinction between the Gift of Fear and the Habit of Hope and examines the proper act of the Gift of Fear; he studies the number and the properties of the Gifts, and their acts and effects in the Beatitudes and the Fruits of the Holy Ghost. He builds up the whole of his teaching into a profound and lucid synthesis in the true spirit of St Thomas.

The translators have added an excellent Introduction in two parts. The first part is historical, giving an account of the author and his work. The second is theological. Its purpose is to place the treatise on the Gifts of the Holy Ghost in line with the general Thomistic teaching on the spiritual life, and also to supplement the author's treatment of the Fruits and the Beatitudes—the one section of his work which is inadequate. They have also prefixed summaries to each chapter, and included a general index, an index of proper names and an index of references to Sacred Scripture.

Dictionnaire de Spiritualité. Fascicules XII and XIII. (Paris: Beauchesne. No price given.)

AFTER being held up by the war, the publication of this monumental Dictionary has now been resumed at the more or less normal rate of one fascicule a year. It is intended to give a complete survey of Ascetical and Mystical Theology from both the doctrinal and the historical aspect. The General Editor is P. Marcel Viller, S.J., and he has the assistance of two eminent confreres, PP. F. Cavallera and M. Olphe-Galliard, and of a number of collaborators, Jesuits and others. The *Dictionnaire* has now reached column 1,775 and the first part of the article on Contemplation—an indication of how vast is its scope and how long it will take to complete. But when complete, it will be a worthy compeer of the several *Dictionnaires* for which we are all deeply indebted to French scholarship.

Fascicule XII opens with the continuation of the long article on Frequent Communion and covers its history in the later Middle Ages and from the Council of Trent to the present day. Other main articles include Spiritual Communion, Concupiscence, Spiritual Conferences, Confirmation in Grace, Conformity to God's Will, Secret Congregations (of clergy and students to promote self-

sanctification and the apostolic spirit—a French institution of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, established also in Italy and Flanders), Self-knowledge, the Conscience, the Gift of Counsel, the Evangelical Counsels, Spiritual Consolation, and Contemplation. This last article is, as we said, incomplete at the end of fascicule XIII. In its full extent it will include a historical and a doctrinal section. The historical section institutes an enquiry into the varying connotation of the term “contemplation”. Père Lebreton assembles and appraises the evidence furnished by the Old and New Testament. Père Arnou studies the philosophers of the Greco-Roman world. Apart from a few pages, the rest of the historical survey from the Eastern Fathers to the present day is reserved for the next fascicule. So too is the whole of the doctrinal section which promises to be very interesting. False forms of mysticism are not treated in this article; the reader is referred for them to the appropriate articles on Illuminism, Quietism, etc. Mystical phenomena are likewise discussed elsewhere under the headings Ecstasy, Rapture, etc. The approach to this lengthy article on Contemplation seems to be very sound, fixing and testing terms in their historical usage according to objective standards, and weighing carefully the pros and cons in the various matters under debate among the theologians. No doubt some will sense a Jesuit bias in the treatment; but the sound objectivity of the article as far as it has gone should dispel any prejudice in the fair-minded.

There are only two outstanding Lives in these fascicules, those of Charles de Condren and of Constantin de Barbanson. Charles de Condren, second Superior of the French Oratory, seemed, said Cardinal de Bérulle, to have received the spirit of the Oratory from the cradle. In spite of his sanctity and the influence he exercised over his more enlightened contemporaries and over his famous disciple, M. Olier, Condren has not in the sequel maintained his rank among the spiritual writers of France. Until recently he has been almost forgotten. The writer of the article finds the reason in the very sublimity of Condren's doctrine and in his preoccupation with eternity which made him appear indecisive in his actions.

Constantin de Barbanson, the seventeenth-century Capuchin mystic, whom Fr Augustine Baker called “the most learned and experienced author of the book called *Secrets Sentiers de l'Amour Divin*”, won considerable popularity, especially in Flanders, by this work, written when he was only thirty-one, and by its sequel, published posthumously, *Anatomie de l'âme et des opérations divines en icelle*. The writer of the present article gives a full and careful analysis of the

doctrine of Barbanson. It is in the pure Franciscan tradition of St Bonaventure and has for its immediate sources the teaching of the two Capuchins, Henri de Erp and the Englishman, Benet Fitch (or Canfield). But Barbanson had read widely outside the Franciscan School; he had assimilated the works of St Thomas, St John of the Cross and St Teresa, and he was well acquainted with the writings of Cardinal de Bérulle, Gerson and Robert Grosseteste, Bishop of Lincoln (an English mediaeval theologian and scholar, too little known in his own country).

The Graces of Interior Prayer. A Treatise of Mystical Theology. By A. Poulain, S.J. Translated by Leonora L. Yorke Smith. Pp. cxii + 665. (Routledge and Kegan Paul, Ltd. 30s.)

It is fifty years since *Des grâces d'oraison* was first published. Père Poulain seems to have intended to write a small book only, but the work grew under his hand until it became a great quarry of descriptive mysticism, covering 700 packed pages. The author did not deal with the speculative side of the subject. He was not a highly trained theologian, and he had no particular bent for speculation; and in any case he believed that speculative mysticism had already been fully worked out. He has the distinction of being one of the chief pioneers in the revival of mystical studies; indeed, he built up what had never been built up before, an orderly synthesis of mystical information and experience, derived from the descriptions of the great contemplatives, and especially from St Teresa.

The original English translation was made some forty years ago from the sixth French edition. The present re-issue of that translation has been corrected in accordance with the tenth French edition of 1922 and contains the masterly introduction of nearly a hundred pages contributed by Père Bainvel, S.J., Dean of the theological faculty at the Institut Catholique, and a valuable Appendix on the Discernment of Spirits by the same theologian. It contains also a much enlarged bibliography.

Père Bainvel's Introduction gives a sketch of the life of Poulain, who had died three years before, and a synopsis of his book. But Bainvel was chiefly concerned with estimating the value of Poulain's great work and making such minor corrections of his thought as were obviously necessary. Much of the Introduction is a defence of Poulain and of what may be called, on a rough and ready grouping, the Teresian School of mysticism. The defence leads the writer into a discussion of the other groupings: the Dominican School of Père Garrigou-Lagrange (with which Saudreau had close affinities) and

the so-called synthesists: Père Maréchal, S.J., who attempted a psychological synthesis with much thought and learning, and Père de la Taille, S.J., who in his little book on Contemplative Prayer (available in English in the excellent *Paternoster Series*) indicated the main lines of a possible theological synthesis. Bainvel considers that the time is not yet ripe for a synthesis, and he subscribes to the wise advice of Père de Guibert, S.J., that our primary need is to agree on a method of approach to this fascinating but confused subject. He writes (summarizing the ideas of de Guibert): "How can this confusion be remedied, the discussions simplified and set in order? First of all, it is necessary to fix and determine the terminology. Then, to study both doctrines and facts *systematically*: for example, the *doctrine* of St Francis de Sales or St Bonaventure, the *false* mystics, so finely described by St Teresa. To put the questions in order, beginning with those on which the others depend; to establish and verify the data before drawing conclusions, etc. Not to reject *a priori* the principle of progress, trying to square St Teresa with Dionysius the Areopagite, or, in spite of his protestations, Tauler with St Thomas. In a word, to proceed methodically, treating questions of theology by theological methods, questions of fact by positive methods." Bainvel considers that it is one of Poulain's great merits that he had already adopted what de Guibert was later to ask for; he chose the descriptive method and he kept to it.

In the valuable *Afterthoughts* prefixed to the second edition of *Western Mysticism* Abbot Butler wrote: "I cannot but think that Poulain's really most valuable book is marred by the defects of his temperament; he was by profession a mathematician, and he proceeds in mystical theology by a mathematical method of clear-cut definitions, propositions and proofs, of which the subject-matter is not patient. A great deal of the obscurity and divergences reigning in the sphere of mystical theology is due to a too rigid and mechanical pressing of theories to their extreme conclusions." Bainvel does not appear to admit that Poulain is such a theorist; and he considers (to take one example) that Saudreau and others who accept Saudreau's authority have misinterpreted Poulain on the fundamental question of the nature of the act of contemplation, namely the perception of God. "Poulain," he writes, "faithful to his method, states facts and quotes the sayings of the mystics without attempting to give them any philosophical interpretation." Hence he does not endeavour to determine what the nature of this perception of God is; *pace* his critics he does not maintain that it is a direct perception of God Himself.

But Bainvel accepts the just criticism that Poulain's presentation of his subject is too mathematical. He finds in him "extreme subdivision, which sometimes interferes with a complete view; classifications that are somewhat artificial, in which definitions and formulas correspond only imperfectly with concrete reality; dissections of living activity in which the soul, the principle of unity, of continuity, even of life, is somewhat withdrawn from the observer's sight".

But, in spite of any defects critics may detect, Poulain's book remains of immense value. Naturally, it is not a book for everyone. Apart from any other consideration, it is too monumental to appeal to the general run of readers. Nor is it suitable for them. It is a book for students of mysticism and for directors of souls; and for these it is indispensable. The English translation is faithful to the original and reads well.

J. C.

Patrology. Vol. I. The beginnings of patristic literature. By Johannes Quasten. Pp. xviii + 349. (Spectrum Publishers, Utrecht. 1950. No price stated, but sold in U.S.A. at \$5.00.)

WHILST literature in English on patristic questions is varied and extensive, a good general work covering the whole field has been lacking. The manuals of patrology now in use are translations, which "do not pay enough attention to versions and studies in English, and have practically gone out of date by the time they reach the reader" (p. vii). To take the two best known: Shahan's translation of Bardenhewer dates from 1908, and even then it lagged seven years behind the German; the English edition of Cayré is much more recent, but it follows the French in taking little or no account of English writings, which the preface inaccurately slights as "extremely scanty". The publication of an original patrology in English is, therefore, of some significance; and a perusal of the volume now before us indicates that the finished work will be of exceptional value. This first volume ends with Irenaeus, and there are to be two further volumes, one on the Latin Fathers to Gregory the Great, and the other on the Greek Fathers to John Damascene.

Manuals of patrology fall into two classes: those that are readable, and those that are not. The first are intended as reference-tools for the student; the second strive to initiate the learner into the science. The author of this work has endeavoured to provide a readable text for the latter purpose, and at the same time to give all the features required for its use as a book of reference. In writing the text, he has succeeded remarkably; in fact, it flows so easily and

smoothly that there is a danger of underestimating its value. A comparison with other accounts shows, however, that clarity of exposition has been combined with accurate and up-to-date information on all points. A special feature is the space given to excerpts, quoted in English, from the different writers. These give the beginner an insight into the thought and beauty of the writings discussed, and tempt him to go further. Where available, the translations used are those of the *Ancient Christian Writers* series, of which the author is the joint-editor.

Learner and specialist are catered for in the extensive bibliographies; editions of texts, translations into modern languages, particularly English, and articles and monographs are listed. Titles of articles are given in full, enabling the reader to choose at a glance the studies he requires. This practice saves much irritation, and also avoids the unpleasant railway-timetable effect of some bibliographies. The different studies and articles are arranged chronologically, according to date of publication; the latest items in some of the lists are from 1949. A certain completeness has been achieved, and these bibliographies compare favourably with other compilations of the same class. The volume closes with full indices; nothing is wanted to make the book thoroughly serviceable.

Apart from the presentation, originality is not called for in a work of this kind. It is, however, new in the sense of being *au courant* with the latest developments. Readers will find a full treatment of the recently discovered sermon of Melito of Sardis (p. 243-6); and as much as can be said at present about the forty-two Gnostic treatises found in Egypt in 1946 is related (p. 277). The pages on the apocryphal writings and those on the early heretical literature are especially well done. A few literals have slipped in, but they may be corrected without difficulty. Hieropolis appears twice in reference to Papias, but in the *ex professo* treatment of that author, his see is given correctly as Hierapolis. In two instances, there is inconsistency regarding the form of name adopted: Bardaisan p. 139, Bardesanes elsewhere; Photios p. 129, Photius elsewhere.

The value of the work is considerably enhanced by its excellent production; indeed, it is a luxurious volume for these days. Strong white paper, very good binding, and an elegant type-face, combine to give a pleasing effect. The arrangement is clear, and, most important, the bibliographies are distinguished from the text, so as not to be an encumbrance to the reader. A wide circulation of this book should do much to stimulate and help the study of patrology. We await the further volumes with some impatience. C. D.

Preaching Well. By William R. Duffey. Pp. xviii + 284. (Bruce Publishing Co., Milwaukee. \$2.75.)

OBVIOUSLY this book should be of particular interest to readers of THE CLERGY REVIEW. The author is Professor of Speech in Marquette University; and although his manual is a modern American production (it contains a chapter on Microphone Technique) it is immediately suitable for use in this country and is worthy of a place among the standard works dealing with that part of a priest's apostolate usually known as Sacred Eloquence. Unhappily much preaching has little of the sacred and less of the eloquence.

To enumerate the chapter headings of the book would give no satisfactory idea of its contents. All the usual aspects of pulpit oratory are found here, some being more stressed than others, in accordance with present-day needs. Actions and gestures receive lengthy treatment, excellent exercises being suggested. We have all known good sermons ruined by the constant repetition of one gesture: for instance that of persistently pressing down non-existent articles in an invisible box, or of constantly bringing the hands down edgeways on the pulpit as though an endless roll of butter were being cut into twelve-inch lengths. Common faults in diction are spoken of and their remedies prescribed. Stress is laid upon the common shortcomings of many preachers: the neglect of Scripture (Ignorance of Scripture is ignorance of Christ), of failing to apply their text and to illustrate by apt example, of speaking differently to different audiences, of note-taking whilst reading. For all such faults the author suggests practical methods of improvement.

If to preach well is difficult, to read well from the pulpit is more so. In various parts of his work the author touches upon this matter, gladly giving away the great secret of good reading: the art of correct phrasing. Since this book is meant for close study, few Parish Priests are likely to gain much benefit from it; time for private study is a luxury seemingly unknown to most of the clergy who have the cure of souls. The author publishes his work expressly for students and seminarians, for whom it should prove of increasing value during the course of their preparation for the priesthood.

The Wisdom of Catholicism. By Anton C. Pegis. Pp. 912. (Michael Joseph. 18s.)

ANTHOLOGIES form a large section of every country's literature, but the number of good anthologies, even in the whole range of literature, is comparatively small. To assemble what is best in poetry and prose calls for something more than scholarship. Culture, good taste

and an appreciation of the arts are needed, together with an insight into what appeals to the mind of man universally in the good and the true and the beautiful. Professor Pegis, by limiting his volume to Catholicism and its written wisdom, exhibits the qualities of a gifted anthologist in a memorable work of quite outstanding merit.

Forbearing to begin with the Bible (the first and greatest of all anthologies) the author opens his long sequence of famous writings with a celebrated letter of St Ignatius of Antioch, who is among the earliest disciples of the Apostles. Then there are set before the reader pages from most of the first-rate Christian apologists, including several from the present century, who have transcribed the teaching of the Church upon a hundred vital questions. It is impossible to mention in these few paragraphs the subjects of the extracts. Let it suffice to say that they demonstrate with forceful clarity the wisdom of the Holy Spirit that Christ promised should never fail His Church. In every age of the Christian era this divine wisdom has been made manifest through the written words of the pre-eminent in knowledge and holiness. They are a glorious company, of every tongue and nation, but they speak with one voice as they unfold the grand theme of Catholic Wisdom.

The unbeliever who will with an open mind study this book can hardly do so without realizing how illogical is his own position. Systems of thought flourish for a time, only to be superseded, whilst Catholic Philosophy remains unassailable through all doctrinal development and evolution of belief. It is the foundation of our reasonable Faith, and it is seen triumphantly prevailing throughout the centuries of Christendom as the reader of this lengthy book follows the history of Catholic Wisdom from one age to another. Here is irrefutable proof of the unity of the Church.

L. T. H.

CORRESPONDENCE

CATHOLICS AND B.B.C. POLICY

(THE CLERGY REVIEW, 1951, XXXV, p. 387)

The Rev. A. Sandwell writes:

As one who has taken more than a passing interest in all sections of religious broadcasts, I found the articles by Fr Agnellus timely and enlightening, especially the following paragraph: "Whatever may have been true in the past, Catholics now have a part in the planning of the work of the Religious Broadcasting Department; our broadcasters are chosen by ourselves and our services are in our own hands; there is no veto and no censorship and no restriction on freedom of expression."

But why is the prayer for England omitted (as I believe it is) during the broadcast of the Benediction service? If I remember aright, in the early days of religious broadcasting the prayer was omitted because it was considered to be controversial and therefore unsuitable. As this prayer seems to be an integral part of the Benediction service, then there would seem to be no reason whatever why it should not be said.

Regarding the morning religious broadcast to schools: this service takes place after the morning religious half-hour, and seems to be foisted upon the children in mixed schools whatever their faith. As the service appears to be of the "Cowper-Temple" kind, then the Catholic children ought not to be made to listen in. Further, I deprecate strongly the inclusion of prayers and religious readings during the children's hour. This hour is purely entertainment, and ought not to be made the vehicle for religious teaching. If a children's service is deemed necessary, then it should be relegated to the hours of religious broadcasts.

A word about those who arrange or conduct Catholic services. It would seem at times that the priest who is conducting the service strives for effect, especially so far as the music is concerned, and treats the listeners to choral gymnastics with a "see what my choir can do" attitude. Flamboyant Latin motets become more than a little wearisome to the listener-in-the-street and even to the ordinary Catholic. Purely liturgical services are not the best for religious broadcasting, and even Vespers from an abbey or college has often only a mingled religious and romantic appeal.

If the Catholic services are to be effective, then they should be

simple, homely, with familiar hymns sung to equally familiar tunes. The ordinary listener is not stirred by something which he is not able to take in easily.

“THE DREAM OF GERONTIUS”

Mgr C. Collingwood, Chairman Catholic Committee, Festival of Britain, writes:

May I be permitted to draw the special attention of your readers to the dramatized performance of *The Dream of Gerontius* which will be presented at the Scala Theatre, Charlotte Street, W.1, from Monday, 10 September, to Saturday, 15 September inclusive, at 7.30 p.m. There will also be two matinees during the week on Thursday and Saturday at 3 p.m.

Among the artistes taking part are the following well-known names; Robert Speaight, Kynaston Reeves, Deryck Guyler, Cyril Conway, Eugene Leahy, Marie Ney, Mary Newcomb, Mary O'Farrell and Louise Lister. The music has been specially written by Fernand Laloux. The production is in the hands of Mr Alan Rye, whose brilliant achievement in the Pageant at Wembley Stadium in October last year is still fresh in the memory.

Already a considerable amount of time and energy have been given to the preparation of the décor and costumes. Everything points to the forthcoming production being a memorable one. It is the earnest desire of the Committee that the Scala Theatre be filled to capacity at each performance and they cordially invite the Clergy to commend the production to their people, and possibly put in hand arrangements for parties from their parishes to attend. Applications for tickets should be made to the Box Office Manager, the Scala Theatre, Charlotte Street, London, W.1. Telephone: MUSEum 5731.

I take this opportunity of informing the Clergy that the Archbishops and Bishops at the Low Week meeting graciously gave permission to their subjects to attend this performance.

[In connexion with this performance a new edition of *The Dream of Gerontius* has just been published by Burns Oates, 2s. 6d.—ED.]

PERMISSU SUPERIORUM

CHURCH AND STATE ABROAD

THE CASE OF ARCHBISHOP GRÖSZ: I

MGR JOSEF GRÖSZ, Archbishop of Kalocsa and acting Chairman of the Hungarian Bench of Bishops, was sentenced on 28 June, 1951, to fifteen years' imprisonment. It is literally true to say that he was imprisoned because he had refused to associate himself with the intensive propaganda against the Western Powers, and against the United States in particular, that is conducted by the Hungarian Government. That is to say, he had declined, even in the face of an ultimatum, to sign the "peace petitions" which are organized to condition the minds of the population, and which have been conducted throughout Eastern Europe on such a scale that, just before the Archbishop's trial opened, the General Secretary of the Hungarian National Peace Council, Ernő Mihályfi, announced that the signatures collected in Hungary alone numbered 7,148,000. The total population of the country, including children, is only about eight and a half millions.¹

It was early in 1950, when the so-called Stockholm Peace Appeal was being launched, that the regime began its great campaign to extract signatures from the Catholic Bishops. The Bishops, with Mgr Grösz as their spokesman, refused, and were then subjected to the intensive pressure described in these pages last October. We told then how the campaign was linked with the threat of the dissolution of the religious Orders,² and the first of the documents

¹ It is difficult to convey, and impossible to exaggerate, the frenzy with which the signature-collecting campaigns are conducted: yet only by attempting to convey it can any real impression be given of the rage of the Government against the Bishops who refused to participate. Teams of "psychological storm-troops" go from street to street, from house to house, visiting every household, to put the people into "the right frame of mind", so that the so-called "people's educators" and the collectors of signatures who follow may meet the desired reception. To the same end not only are special mass "meetings of enlightenment" held all over the country, but every concert, theatrical performance, sports event or any other occasion where people gather in large numbers is used to "enlighten" those not yet aware of the dangers threatening peace as a result of the machinations of the Western imperialist warmongers. In support of their propaganda the Communists make use wherever possible of the names of such Catholic priests as they have been able to beguile or intimidate into signing.

We could fill many pages with almost incredible quotations from the Hungarian newspapers to illustrate the whole process. Thus in *Világosság* of 11 April, 1951, there is an article on correct and incorrect methods used by the "people's educators". One of the incorrect methods is the use of "express tempo": and the example is given of one district where on a single Sunday morning 613 "agitators" collected 3500 signatures. "This means that 300 pairs of people's educators collected more than ten signatures each. It is impossible to convince ten people in one morning and carry on an efficient work of enlightenment."

² *Vide* THE CLERGY REVIEW, October 1950, p. 9 et seq.

CHURCH AND STATE ABROAD

which we print this month is the Joint Pastoral Letter on this topic which the Hungarian Bishops issued on 31 May, 1950. Eventually Mgr Grösz felt himself obliged, on behalf of the Hierarchy, to conclude an Agreement with the State, which he did on 1 August.¹

It was not long before the Bishops found how this Agreement could be used against them, when they were asked to come out as supporters of the regime in connection with the local government elections at the end of October. M. Revai, whose speech in June had marked the beginning of a new phase in the pressure against the Church, made this clear in an election speech at Szeged on 12 October, when he warned the Bishops that the Agreement must be interpreted in the regime's terms, "and not considered as a tactical step for gaining time". The Bishops had in fact met a week before, on 5 October, to discuss the problem of these elections, and, after some difficulty, had produced a brief Pastoral Letter, which forms the second in our series of documents this month. It was read in the churches on 15 October. The concluding sentence is a classic expression of the dilemma which confronts the Bishops in all the countries "behind the Iron Curtain", when they have to decide how much they must "collaborate", how far they must go in the way of signing agreements, and so forth, in order to ensure the continuance of the pastoral life of the Church:

Amid the many difficulties confronting us, we trust that, as a consequence of our taking part in the elections, we shall be able without let or hindrance to continue to foster in your minds and in those of your children the Faith of which the survival will compensate for all external losses.

The Bishops had a brief respite in the winter, even though this Pastoral Letter cannot have been pleasing to the regime. In February, however, the period of respite ended. From 23 to 26 February the Cominform held a "Peace Congress" in Berlin, which set the programme for 1951 as the Stockholm meeting a year before had set the programme for 1950. At the same time the regime's organization of apostate priests² sprang into renewed activity. The dates may well have been concerted. The machinery was set in motion for a fresh nation-wide collection of signatures, this time to support the Berlin demands for a Conference of the Foreign Ministers of the Great Powers. The apostate priests held a Conference in Budapest in February, at which there was much talk of "frequent misinterpretations" of the Agreement between Church and State.

The fourth Article of the first part of the Agreement had said:

¹ Text in *THE CLERGY REVIEW*, October 1950.

² *Vide THE CLERGY REVIEW*, October 1950, p. xiii.

CHURCH AND STATE ABROAD

The Board of Bishops support the movement for peace. They approve of the endeavours of the Hungarian people and of the Government of the Hungarian People's Republic for the protection of peace. They condemn all warmongering, they condemn the use of the atomic weapon, and they consider, in consequence, any Government making first use of the atomic weapon as guilty of a crime committed against humanity.

The wording of this echoed the wording of the Stockholm Appeal, and the official interpretation of it was that it committed the Bishops to supporting the Berlin Manifesto. As the spring went on the pressure on them increased, and when they met in Budapest in Low Week they drew up a Pastoral Letter of which the text is the third in our series of documents this month. It was read in the churches on Sunday, 8 April, and is quite masterly in its phrasing. Avoiding all reference to the Berlin Manifesto, and all Cominform language about warmongers and imperialists, it takes its cue from the letter that had been sent in January to Pope Pius XII by none other than the President of the Communist-inspired World Peace Council, Professor Joliot-Curie.¹ That letter saluted the Pope as one who had frequently expressed his solicitude for the cause of peace, and was intended to elicit from the Holy Father some reply which might be quoted to the East European Bishops and clergy as a trump card in persuading them to subscribe to the Cominform's anti-Western propaganda. The reply was in fact much too cleverly couched. The Hungarian Bishops, in this Pastoral Letter, quoted passages from the Pope that had been cited by Professor Joliot-Curie himself for their similarity to the professed aims of the Communist peace campaign, and quoted also from the reply sent on behalf of the Holy Father by Mgr Montini. They concluded:

There is little that we can add to these words. The wishes and efforts of our Holy Father should serve in pointing the way to every Catholic. We believe that the realization of a lasting peace will come not from war but as a result of the rule of justice and charity. Those who act justly serve peace, and those who practise charity serve peace and oppose war. . . .

There was indeed nothing more to be said. But the Communists were not at all pleased. M. György Parragi, the "progressive Catholic" who has become the Communist Party's mouthpiece in Hungary for ecclesiastical affairs, made it clear in *Magyar Nemzet*, a fellow-traveller journal for middle-class intellectuals, how unsatisfactory the position was:

¹ Letter printed in the *Osservatore Romano* of 5 March, 1951; cf. *The Tablet*, 10 March, 1951.

CHURCH AND STATE ABROAD

There is no place for any tactics or manoeuvres where signing the Berlin Peace Manifesto is concerned. . . . This is a question that cannot be passed over, not even if we preach or write in the most sublime words of peace. . . . Those who want to show that they are sincere adherents of peace, that they hate war and indignantly reject the idea of an imperialist war, must quote the words of the Berlin Peace Manifesto.

Not to have done so was to be deemed to have opted for the Western Powers against the Cominform. On 13 April, a few days after this Pastoral Letter had been read, *Szabad Nep*, the official Communist newspaper, revealed with indignation that Mgr Grösz had refused to receive the members of his local Peace Committee, let alone sign the Manifesto, and that two other Bishops, Mgr Hamvas, Bishop of Csanad, and Mgr Peteri, Bishop of Vac, had done the same, basing their refusal on the ground that all such gestures were made superfluous by the Pastoral Letter. *Szabad Nep* commented:

There is certainly much talk of peace in this declaration (*sc.*, the Pastoral Letter), but that is not enough. It was the Bishops' duty also to sign the Government-sponsored appeal, in accordance with last year's Agreement between Church and State. One can separate oneself from the masses in the question of peace only as a leper is separated from the healthy.

And *Szabad Nep* likewise uttered a threat;

If Josef Grösz, Andrew Hamvas, and Josef Peteri wanted to show that they do not consider themselves bound by the Agreement, and that they do not identify themselves with the most sacred feelings of the Hungarian people, they have most certainly succeeded. The Hungarian Government and people will not forget this. . . .

On the following day, 14 April, perhaps in answer, the Bishops published the text of a statement which, in addition to the Pastoral Letter, they had drawn up at their Low Week meeting. This statement forms our final document this month. It points out on how many occasions even before the signature of the Agreement the Bishops had expressed their devotion to the cause of peace, as, indeed, every Christian must, but it makes it clear that "they did not wish to encroach on national or international politics". They would continue to work for peace in the language of moral theology, but they would not lend their names to documents of which the real purpose was to make propaganda against the Western Powers.¹

¹ On the same day, 14 April, a renegade priest was reported by *Szabad Nep* to have expressed his "deepest indignation" at the Bishops' refusal to sign, and the Bishops were said to have "unmasked" themselves as enemies of peace who had nothing in common with the "broad masses" of the Hungarian people. On 15

CHURCH AND STATE ABROAD

The crisis came in the following month. A Bill for the establishment in Hungary of a State Office of Church Affairs, similar to those already existing in Czechoslovakia and Poland,¹ was introduced in the National Assembly in May by the egregious M. György Parragi, and speedily passed without a debate of any kind. The pattern for the Church was the same as in Czechoslovakia. Whereas in the Western countries, said M. Parragi, the Church was everywhere separated from the State "in a most radical manner", the State not granting the Church "a cent, a franc or a penny", Hungary would pay liberal stipends to the clergy. It went without saying, however, that subservience would be required in exchange for this bounty. The new State Office for Church Affairs was entrusted with

the settlement of all matters concerning personnel and material in connection with State assistance to the Churches and denominations, and the enforcement of all Government regulations concerning the Churches.²

On 12 May it was publicly announced by the Hungarian National Peace Committee, and broadcast over Budapest Radio, that the Bishops had signed the Berlin Manifesto. György Parragi himself broadcast a commentary, "noting with pleasure" the decision of the Bishops, which, he said, came better late than never. It is evident that Mgr Grösz had been presented with an ultimatum, that his acceptance of it had been taken for granted, and that in fact he had rejected it. Once that had happened, and the National Peace Committee had made itself publicly ridiculous, his arrest was inevitable. *Szabad Nep* reported that all the Bishops except him had called on M. Istvan Kossa to establish relations with the State Office of Church Affairs. Mgr Grösz had not called, because he was by then in the pitiless hands of the political police.

(To be concluded. Documents follow overleaf)

April an article called "Omissions from the Pastoral Letter" appeared in *A Kereszt*, the organ of the organization of renegade priests. Its main point was that the Pastoral Letter "lacked a decided attitude", because, although it "spoke of peace and took the side of peace", it made no reference to the Berlin Manifesto.

¹ For the Czechoslovak counterpart, *vide* THE CLERGY REVIEW, February 1950, p. xiii, note; June 1951, p. vi, note, and *passim*; for the Polish, *ibid.*, January 1951, p. xiii.

² The head of the State Office for Church Affairs was to be M. Istvan Kossa, a man of 47 who had been a member of the Communist Party since his youth. Before the war, when a tram-driver in Budapest, he had been imprisoned for subversive Communist activities, and after serving his sentence he had gone to Moscow, returning to Hungary with the Red Army in 1945. He became in turn Minister of Religious Affairs and Education and head of the Wage Control Board, and was appointed to the Central Committee of the Hungarian Communist Party.

CHURCH AND STATE ABROAD

JOINT PASTORAL LETTER OF THE HUNGARIAN BENCH OF BISHOPS ON THE THREATENED DISSOLUTION OF THE RELIGIOUS ORDERS: MAY 1950¹

"DEARLY BELOVED IN CHRIST: During the past months the attention and love of the Christians in Hungary has turned increasingly towards the members of the religious Orders.

"The religious Orders are almost as ancient as the Church, and during their existence of nearly two thousand years they have always been the beloved and respected institution of the Church. The spirit of the monastic life is the pure Gospel. In the Gospel of Christ there are commandments which bind everybody, and there are also so-called evangelical counsels, which are addressed to those who have undertaken to follow Our Lord Christ completely. Such counsels are voluntary poverty, and the chastity which renounces marriage and commands a complete dedication to God, as well as obedience, abjuring one's own will for the sake of a superior will. The reason and root of all three renunciations is love for God. Their aim is to free the soul for the self-sacrificing service of God and of fellow-men.

"These counsels are institutionally realized in the religious Orders. The institution of the religious Orders is not the invention of pious and calculating men, but is the idea of the Gospel. We may also say that it is its flower, an integral part of the Church and a necessary adjunct of the Christian community.

"Therefore the guarantee of the possibility of monastic life is an inseparable part of the free exercise of religion. To make it impossible is in direct conflict with the law granting freedom of religion. In contrast to this, unfortunately, we see with pain that in our days very frequently repeated procedures often disregard the law on the freedom of religion, and more than once attack the possibility of monastic life at its roots.

"The Episcopate raised its voice of protest to the Hungarian Government in a letter dated 27 February (1950)—a letter supported by factual evidence. The Provincials of the religious Orders did likewise in their Memorandum, which they presented on 15 April.

"We are well aware that in numerous cases these transgressions of the law originate not with the responsible authorities but through the excesses of local organs. But we also find that members of the religious Orders are unprotected, frequently without the possibility of remedy, and at the mercy of those who take a stand against them. The procedures harassing them do not cease, but continue with greater frequency and ruthlessness.

"All these happenings fill us with pain, and our soul commands us to give expression to our pain and fraternal compassion to the suffering Religious, as well as to you, our flock. We beseech you to pray with us for the harassed Religious, and to join us in brotherly love to help them to maintain their existence."

Budapest, 31 May, 1950.

(Signatures follow)

PASTORAL LETTER ISSUED BY THE HUNGARIAN BENCH OF BISHOPS: OCTOBER 1950²

"DEAR BRETHREN,—When they concluded their Agreement with the Hungarian Government, the Hungarian Bench of Bishops expressed their readiness to support the endeavours aiming at increasing the well-being of the people. At the same time they took their stand in support of the cause of peace also; for, after all, war paralyses production and threatens with destruction the very foundations of well-being, the means of production, the property (assets) which have been accumulated, and our cultural values, furthermore, indeed, threatening to destroy the lives of masses of innocent human beings. In the spirit of our Agreement we now call upon you, Dear Brethren, conscientiously to exercise your right

¹ Text from N.C.W.C. news service, 6 July, 1950.

² Text from *Magyar Kurir*, 15 October 1950.

CHURCH AND STATE ABROAD

to vote, on the occasion of the Council Elections. God grant that as a result of the elections the right to manage the affairs of our people may come into the hands of persons who will exercise this right absolutely unselfishly and exclusively in the interests of the community, and will serve the cause of both internal and external reconciliation (appeasement). In conformity with our calling, we shall bear in mind also the liberty and rights of our Church. Amid the many difficulties confronting us, we trust that as a consequence of our taking part in the elections, we shall be able without let or hindrance to continue to foster in your minds and in those of your children the Faith, the survival of which will compensate for all external losses."

Budapest, 5 October, 1950.

THE HUNGARIAN BENCH OF BISHOPS.

Read in all churches of the country on Sunday, 15 October, 1950.

JOINT PASTORAL LETTER OF THE HUNGARIAN BENCH OF BISHOPS ON THE PEACE CAMPAIGN: APRIL 1951¹

The Hungarian Bench of Bishops have issued the following Pastoral Letter, which will be read out today, Sunday, 8 April, in every church at every Holy Mass.

"**DEAR FAITHFUL:** Our Christmas Peace Message referred to the Angel's message of peace. Now at Eastertide we likewise direct your attention to the Redeemer's words, with which He greeted His disciples. It is the intensive longing of all peoples for peace, manifested in peace movements all over the world, that impels us to speak of peace again.

"On 26 January of this year the President of the World Peace Council addressed himself directly to our Holy Father, Pope Pius XII, begging him to support efforts aimed at the reduction of armaments.²

"It is unnecessary to say that the President of the World Peace Council approached the quarter where peace is most sincerely desired and where the realization of this aim is most consistently striven for. This fact, however, is even recognized by the President of the World Peace Council, when referring in his letter *inter alia* to the Holy Father's Christmas Peace Messages of 1939 and 1941, and to the papal Encyclical on peace of 19 July, 1951.³ The President's letter quotes the Pope's words as follows:

"We must not allow the misfortune of a new world war, involving economic and social destruction, moral disturbances and degeneration, to overtake mankind for a third time. In order to prevent this catastrophe it is necessary to carry out a gradual and complete disarmament seriously and honestly (1941)."

"He further quotes the wise words of the late Pope Benedict XV:

"It must be the foundation of our view to replace the material force of weapons by the morality of law, which would ensure a just and fair agreement to reduce, at one and the same time, the armaments of all nations, in accordance with guarantees and conditions to be decided upon (1919)."

"Concerning atomic, bacteriological, chemical, poisonous and radio-active weapons, and other weapons designed for mass-destruction, the President of the World Peace Council refers to the following words of Pope Pius XII in his Encyclical on peace of July 1950:

"With progress, modern technique has invented and created such destructive and inhuman weapons, by which it is possible to destroy not only armies and fleets, cities and villages; not only the inestimable values and treasures of religion, art or culture; but also innocent children with their mothers, the sick, the infirm and the aged. Everything that has been beautiful, good and sound that the human mind has achieved may be partly destroyed or annihilated in war."

¹ Text from *Magyar Kurir*, 8 April, 1951.

² Letter to Pope Pius XII from Professor Joliot-Curie, printed in the *Osservatore Romano* of 5 March, 1951; cf. *The Tablet* of 10 March, 1951.

³ Encyclical *Summi Maeroris* of Pope Pius XII.

CHURCH AND STATE ABROAD

"Dear Faithful: The President of the World Peace Council spoke nothing but the truth when he recognized the Pope's efforts for peace. The letter of the Pope's Secretariate¹ also noted with satisfaction the President's recognition of the fact that the Holy Father has always raised his voice in the interests of peace—of a just peace. We read in the Under-Secretary's letter:

"It is evident that the representative of the King of Peace, the visible Head of the Church, whose mission is the assertion of truth and charity, cannot foster more ardent hopes than that Peace on Earth and Goodwill to Men shall be a reality. Nobody, therefore, can doubt that the Holy See will, as it has always done, continue its work in the service of peace—in the service of a just peace according to the principles based on the teaching of Christ. We desire that these efforts shall find understanding in the consciences of Governments, of peoples and of individuals."

"Dear Faithful: There is little that we can add to these words. The wishes and efforts of our Holy Father should serve in pointing the way to every Catholic. We believe that the realization of a lasting peace will come not from war but as a result of the rule of justice and charity. Those who act justly serve peace, and those who practise charity, serve peace and oppose war. To do justice and to practise charity means not only words, but acts. But prayer also is a deed and an act. We have drawn your attention again and again to this fact, knowing that, according to the Psalm, 'Unless the Lord build the house, they labour in vain that build it: unless the Lord keep the city, he watcheth in vain that keepeth it.' We likewise work in vain for peace if we work without God.

"We therefore ordain that Eastertide devotions and May litanies should be offered for peace; and let us pray during May, on every occasion, a *Pater Noster* and an *Ave Maria* especially for peace.

"But, dear Faithful, strive by living a holy Christian life, practising charity one to another, and by removing all hatred from your hearts, to deserve God's peace. Amen."

Budapest, 3 April, 1951.

(Signatures follow)

DECLARATION OF THE HUNGARIAN BENCH OF BISHOPS IN CONNECTION WITH THE "BERLIN MANIFESTO": APRIL 1951²

At their last Conference the Hungarian Bench of Bishops made the following declaration:

"THE Bench of Bishops have repeatedly expressed their point of view, according to which they welcome every effort directed to the maintenance and the ensurance of peace, hoping for God's blessing thereon. This they did in their letter of 14 June, 1949, addressed to the Committee for the Preparation of the Hungarian Peace Congress, and also in their Manifesto of 28 April, 1950, and further in points I to IV of the Agreement concluded with the Government, apart from Pastorals to the clergy and the faithful.

"On all these occasions, however, within the province of their vocation, they wished to continue their own endeavours for peace in the purely religious and moral sphere, and, in particular, they did not wish to encroach on national or international politics. They adhere to the same position now, when giving a Declaration, in their own name and independently, as representatives of a divine institution which is nearly two thousand years old and which is based on the Bible, the Book of Peace. Faithful to the spirit of this Book and of the teaching which it contains, we sincerely approve of every man, nation or organization of good will whose efforts are directed to the prevention of war and its horrors, and we desire that the leaders of the nations and the United Nations should agree on the principles and means by which a lasting and more permanent peace can be realized."

Budapest, 3 April, 1951.

(Signatures follow)

¹ Reply on behalf of the Holy Father by Mgr Montini, *Sostituto* at the Secretariate of State, to the President of the World Peace Council; printed in the *Osservatore Romano* of 5 March, 1951.

² Text from *Magyar Kurir*, 14 April, 1951.

out
e's
act
f a

ble
ty,
to
ill,
ice
ist.
of

hes
lic.
s a
and
to
an
at,
ain
it.'

be
ster

city
d's

:

ew,
nce
l in
a of
50,
ent,

hey
and
l or
g a
vine
the
ning
n of
and
gree
can

)
o the